

**WL-TR-97-8008**

**MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY FOR HIGH  
VOLTAGE POWER SUPPLIES (HVPS)**

**Volume II - Program Details**



Northrop Grumman Corporation  
Electronics and Systems Integration Division  
600 Hicks Road  
Rolling Meadows IL 60008

AUGUST 1996

Final Technical Report For Period 16 March 1990 - 17 January 1995

Approved for Public Release; Distribution is Unlimited.

**19970509 048**

MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY DIRECTORATE  
WRIGHT LABORATORY  
AIR FORCE MATERIEL COMMAND  
WRIGHT PATTERSON AFB OH 45433-7739

## NOTICE

When Government drawings, specifications, or other data are used for any purpose other than in connection with a definitely related Government procurement operation, the United States Government thereby incurs no responsibility nor any obligation whatsoever; and the fact that the government may have formulated, furnished, or in any way supplied the said drawings, specifications, or other data, is not to be regarded by implication or otherwise as in any manner licensing the holder or any other person or corporation, or conveying any rights or permission to manufacture, use, or sell any patented invention that may in any way be related thereto.

This report has been reviewed by the Office of Public Affairs (ASC/PA) and is releasable to the National Technical Information Service (NTIS). At NTIS, it will be available to the general public, including foreign nations.

This technical report has been reviewed and is approved for publication.

  
P. MICHAEL PRICE  
Project Engineer  
Components & Processes Branch  
Electronics Division

  
CHARLES STRECKER  
Chief  
Components & Processes Branch  
Electronics Division

  
RICHARD REMSKI, Chief  
Electronics Division  
Manufacturing Technology Directorate

"If your address has changed, if you wish to be removed from our mailing list, or if the addressee is no longer employed by your organization please notify WL/MTMC, Bldg. 653, 2977 P St., Suite 6, W-PAFB, OH 45433-7739 to help us maintain a current mailing list."

Copies of this report should not be returned unless return is required by security considerations, contractual obligations, or notice on a specific document.

# REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

**FORM APPROVED  
OMB NO. 0704-0188**

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503.

<b>1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave Blank)</b>		<b>2. REPORT DATE</b> August 1996	<b>3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED</b> Final 03/16/90 - 01/17/95
<b>4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE</b> MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY FOR HIGH VOLTAGE POWER SUPPLIES (HVPS) Volume II - Program Details		<b>5. FUNDING NUMBERS</b> C F33615-89-C-5704 PE 78011 PR 3095 TA 04 WU 10	
<b>6. AUTHOR(S)</b>		<b>8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER</b>	
<b>7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)</b> Northrop Grumman Corporation Electronics and Systems Integration Division 600 Hicks Road Rolling Meadows, IL 60008		<b>10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REP NUMBER</b> WL-TR-97-8008	
<b>9. SPONSORING MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)</b> Wright Laboratory, Manufacturing Technology Directorate Air Force Materiel Command Wright-Patterson AFB, OH 45433-7739 POC: P. Michael Price, WL/MTMC, (937) 255-2461		<b>11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES</b>	
<b>12a. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT</b> Approved for Public Release; Distribution is Unlimited.		<b>12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE</b>	
<b>13. ABSTRACT</b> <p>This report is the culmination of a multi-year manufacturing technology program sponsored by the Electronics Division of Wright Laboratory Manufacturing Technology Directorate (WL/MTM). The program was jointly conducted by Northrop Grumman Electronics and Integration Division as the prime contractor and Hughes Aircraft Company Technology Support Division as the principal subcontractor. The thrust of this program was to improve the reliability of High Voltage Power Supplies (HVPS). This was accomplished by conducting a comprehensive evaluation of the materials, components and processes used to produce HVPS. To demonstrate the benefits of the program the lessons learned were incorporated into two existing HVPS, ALQ-135 and AMRAAM. Several of these upgraded high voltage assemblies were fabricated and tested to measure the benefits resulting from the changes.</p> <p>The report is published in four volumes. The first volume is a summary of the technical activity and highlights of the program. The remaining three volumes provide the specific program and procedural details and reference information generated in performance of the effort. This report, Volume II - Program Details, gives introductory and background information, the approach used, design/development considerations and general information for use by High Voltage Power Supply designers and manufacturers.</p>			
<b>14. SUBJECT TERMS</b> High Voltage Power Supplies (HVPS), Traveling Wave Tube, High Voltage Materials Testing and Screening.		<b>15. NUMBER OF PAGES</b> 125	
		<b>16. PRICE CODE</b>	
<b>17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT</b> Unclassified	<b>18. SECURITY CLASS OF THIS PAGE</b> Unclassified	<b>19. SECURITY CLASS OF ABSTRACT</b> Unclassified	<b>20. LIMITATION ABSTRACT</b> SAR

Standard Form 298 (Rev 2-89)  
 Prescribed by ANSI Std Z239-18  
 298-102

DESIGN AND MANUFACTURING GUIDELINES FOR HIGH VOLTAGE POWER SUPPLIES

VOLUME 2

PROGRAM DETAILS

Table Of Contents

	Pages
1.0 Design Considerations	1
1.1 Quality Function Deployment (QFD)	1
1.2 Design of Experiments	2
1.2.1 Model Test Structures	3
1.2.2 Analysis Of Variance (ANOVA)	11
1.2.3 Statistical Test Plan For Characterizing Materials And Components	18
1.3 High Voltage Power Supply Design And Packaging Considerations	29
2.0 Characteristics Of Encapsulants	33
2.1 Introduction	33
2.1 Material Comparisons	34
2.2 Standard Test Methods	35
3.0 Test Parameters Of Components	36
4.0 Environmental Stress Testing	40
5.0 Cost-Benefit Analysis	44
6.0 Data Base Programs	49

Appendix 2-1    A Guide For Using The QFD  
Appendix 2-2    CenBASE/Materials\* Database  
                 Information

\*Trademark

## GENERAL INTRODUCTION

The Guidelines contained here-in are presented in four volumes:

Volume 1, Design and Manufacturing Guidelines for High Voltage Power Supply, Program Summary.

Volume 2, Program Details, gives introductory and background information, the approach used, design/development considerations and general information for use by High Voltage Power Supply designers and manufacturers.

Volume 3, Procedural Details, contains procedures on how to perform the various component, material and process evaluations, and gives results obtained from the Northrop Grumman/ Hughes Aircraft Company efforts. The volume 3 procedures are basically stand alone documents and have been numbered as such. They can be referenced for specific areas of interest or treatment of problems; however, when reference is made to Model Test Structures, Volume 3 should be viewed for specific construction details.


Volume 4, Reference Information, contains specific construction details on Model Test Structures used throughout the program as well as test results obtained from the various material and component studies.

The information developed in these four volumes is the result of a joint Northrop Grumman Electronics Systems and Hughes Electro-Optical Systems effort initially begun in mid-1990. The initiative and primary funding for this effort was provided by Wright-Patterson AFB, Wright Labs ManTech Directorate, project manager M. Price. Supplemental funding from internal R & D funds was also provided by Northrop Grumman. General Research Corporation (J. Basine, K. Dunker) and consultant, W. Dunbar, served as contract monitors during the course of the program.

Note: Because the information presented is from research provided by multiple sources within each of the two contractors (as well as numerous third party sources), the writing styles, formatting and print emphasis vary somewhat. This should not detract from the content in any way.

## 1.0 DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS

A successful HVPS requires a systematic design approach that takes into account the details and interactions of parts and processes needed to obtain reliable performance. Existing designs that need upgrades to improve either performance or reliability must also be viewed globally to obtain solutions that truly enhance performance rather than correcting a problem in one area while creating a problem in another. A four step systematic approach has evolved from the work on this program that has proven beneficial to accomplish the goals of a successful improvement program:



1. DEFINE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES
2. MODEL TEST STRUCTURES
3. STATISTICAL EVALUATION OF RESULTS
4. DECISION MAKING PROCESS

### 1.1 Quality Function Deployment

QFD is a systematic approach to product design that seeks to identify all the factors and variables that have a bearing on performance, and then systematically optimizes the components, materials and processes at the lowest levels via a matrix test program. Evaluation at the subassembly level then follows and is often via a model test structure (simulates actual hardware) to reduce time and cost while allowing a focused approach for the evaluation. Appendix 2-1 is the QFD for High Voltage Power Supplies.

## 1.2 Design Of Experiments

Analysis of process variations, comparative evaluation of encapsulant properties, or measurement of model test structure performance all require an understanding of how to design an experiment and create the statistical analysis associated with obtaining meaningful results.

The following sections describe a Taguchi statistical approach to designing a model test structure evaluation (section 1.2.1), analysis of variation (ANOVA) which allows a comparison of several groups of data (section 1.2.2), and a statistical plan for characterizing material and components (section 1.2.3).

### 1.2.1 Model Test Structures

Model test structures (MTSs) are physical devices that replicate a portion of the system of interest, and incorporate one or more of its key variables. MTSs should be as simple as possible - subject to the need to develop the information of interest. They can be as simple as a pair of electrodes encapsulated in a potting material.

In that example, when several sets of such electrodes are separated by one or more precisely known gaps, and are encapsulated in several different potting materials, the critical electric field behavior of the encapsulants can be studied as a function of applied voltage, voltage stress, ambient temperature, ambient humidity, encapsulant material type, encapsulation conditions and processes, etc. As can be seen from this example, a great deal of information can often be developed from very simple and inexpensive structures. And one of the principal virtues of simple structures is their low cost. Such MTS can often be tested in relatively large numbers for relatively low cost. In this way, multiple sets of experimental conditions can be tried, and a sufficient number of repetitions for each data point can be made in order to improve the data's statistical significance.

MTSs are used to test key independent variables that will affect some aspect of the power supply's performance. Some independent variables are nearly always critical to power supply performance. Among these are temperature, voltage stress, the mechanical and electrical properties of encapsulant materials, and particular characteristics associated with individual components in the power supply. Others may be specific to particular designs, or in-use requirements. In either case, identifying the key variables that will affect the performance of the power supply, or a portion of it, is the first step in designing an MTS. If it is likely that several variables will interact, as do temperature and the dielectric standoff properties of polymeric encapsulants for example, it may be important to incorporate both variables within a model test structure, in order to test and understand their interactions. Taguchi matrix-style design of experiments (DOE) studies are an ideal way to quickly develop an understanding of interactions among independent variables as they affect a particular dependent variable of interest.

When necessary, model test structures can be as complex as an entire subsystem. And, toward the end of any power supply design program, a prototype design will be produced in the form of an engineering development model (EDM) in order to test and verify the design concepts that were developed during earlier model test structure - design of experiments (MTS-DOE) studies, and to resolve any remaining issues identified in the QFDs. This EDM should represent the last MTS in a successful power supply design program.

MTSs are developed for testing, and they are best tested using a design of experiments approach. In a designed experiment, a plan is made to efficiently test for

the values of one or more dependent variables when the values of one or more independent variables are changed. Contrary to one's intuition, it is possible to vary more than one independent variable at a time, and get results that can be understood. The effects of a change in a specific independent variable on a specific dependent variable can be accurately determined even if all other variables are not held constant. And, as discussed above, by varying several independent variables in a single test, it is possible to understand variable - variable interactions. Nevertheless, it is not always either necessary or desireable to vary more than one variable. Conventional, non-matrixed experiments can also be designed experiments, and can sometimes facilitate understanding as well as, or better than, a more complex matrixed, multi-variate test.


Multi-variate testing can, however, often help to minimize the total number of experiments that must be performed in order to garner the same information and understanding. Consider, for example, a simple three dimensional space defined by two independent variables and one dependent variable. In real systems, the response of the dependent variable to changes in the independent variables will generally be described by a regular surface, and this surface will often be a smoothly varying one. The properties of such a smoothly varying three dimensional surface can often be well enough understood by determining the values of the independent variable for only a very few key combinations of values for the dependent variables. These represent only a few points on the surface, perhaps at the corners and a few points on the interior of the surface. Not only can the surface be understood, but its projections in each of the planes defined by a single independent variable and the dependent variable can also often be understood. It is in this same sense that matrixed, multi-variate DOEs can provide the necessary information with a relatively small number of data points, and can provide information on single variable effects even while more than one variable is being changed at a time.

For illustration, consider a designed experiment on series connected rectifier diodes, and this experiment can serve to illustrate the important considerations in DOE. In this experiment, we want to determine the operating voltage,  $V_{op}$ , of the diodes as a function of the key independent variables, the number of series connected diodes, the type of encapsulant used, and the temperature of the environment in which the diodes were operating. In the language of DOE, particularly when employing Taguchi matrices, these independent variables are referred to as "factors." The values for these variables are referred to as "levels." This term suggests discrete values for these variables, and that is how they are used. Each such discrete value for a factor is referred to as a level. In the case of our diode experiment:

<u>Factor Name</u>	<u>Factor Symbol</u>	<u>Level 1</u>	<u>Level 2</u>
Number of diodes in series	D	1	4
Type of encapsulant	E	A	B
Operating Temperature	T	Low	High

Thus, we could study single diodes and strings of four diodes, two different encapsulant materials, and two different operating temperatures, low (ambient), and high (elevated). The first two variables are inherently discretely valued - that is, it is only possible to have integral numbers for these variables. By choosing two levels for each, we have somewhat arbitrarily selected two of the many possible values for these variables. However, if these values make sense from a system standpoint, they can easily be justified. The third variable, temperature, is actually continuously valued - there are actually an infinite number of values for the variable the maximum and minimum temperature limits imposed by experimental conditions. The choice of two levels for this variable may appear to be equally arbitrary, however, if they make sense from an system viewpoint, their choice can be supported. The choices of factor sets and levels for each factor should be done by the HVPS component, material, design, packaging, process, test, and manufacturing engineers who are members of the multi-functional concurrent engineering design team.

Interactions can exist among these variables, and the interactions can also be assigned discrete levels, even if the interaction variable is continuously valued. For example:



The "D X E" notation indicates the interaction, resulting in different values for the dependent variable  $V_{op}$ , between the factors D and E. In this case, there are three factors, each of which has two levels. In addition, there are four interactions D x E, D x T, E x T, and D x E x T, each of which we can consider to be present at two levels, as discussed above.

The existence of three factors, each of which has two levels, defines an  $L_8$  orthogonal array. This is one of the standard set of orthogonal arrays that have been published by Taguchi and others. Its appearance, in the form that includes all of the interactions, is shown below.

<u>Run</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>E</u>	<u>D x E</u>	<u>T</u>	<u>D x T</u>	<u>E x T</u>	<u>DxExT</u>
1	1	A	I	LOW	I	I	I
2	1	A	I	HIGH	II	II	II
3	1	B	II	HIGH	II	I	I
4	1	B	II	HIGH	II	I	I
5	4	A	II	LOW	II	I	II
6	4	A	II	HIGH	I	II	I
7	4	B	I	LOW	II	II	I
8	4	B	I	HIGH	I	I	II

This array, developed using linear algebra, defines a set of eight experimental runs, in terms of the the combinations of levels for each factor, that will exhaustively test the response of the dependent variable to the independent variables. In each run, the factors D, E, and T are set for the indicated levels. The interactions D x E, D x T, E x T, and D x E x T, will have the indicated levels in each run.

To perform the experiment, a set of MTSs are constructed that incorporate these factors, and the above sets of their levels. Like all other sets of MTSs, these incorporate four key properties:

- They are experimental samples that incorporate the factors and levels to be studied,
- All the MTSs in the matrixed set incorporate the same set of factors,
- MTSs from different runs in a matrixed set incorporate different combinations of levels, and
- Multiple identical samples (repeats) may be used in single experimental “runs” to improve the statistical significance of the result.

In the case where three “repeats” were used for each sample run, there will be three values for  $V_{op}$ , for each run, or a total of 24 results for the test. An abstract from the table of results might look like that below:

<u>Run</u>	<u>Level for "E"</u>	<u>Measured V<sub>op</sub></u>	<u>Totals</u>
1	A	V <sub>a</sub> , V <sub>b</sub> , V <sub>c</sub>	1
2	A	V <sub>a</sub> , V <sub>c</sub> , V <sub>f</sub>	2
3	B	V <sub>g</sub> , V <sub>l</sub> , V <sub>i</sub>	3
4	B	V <sub>j</sub> , V <sub>l</sub> , V <sub>q</sub>	4
5	A	V <sub>m</sub> , V <sub>n</sub> , V <sub>o</sub>	5
6	A	V <sub>r</sub> , V <sub>e</sub> , V <sub>r</sub>	6
7	B	V <sub>s</sub> , V <sub>e</sub> , V <sub>u</sub>	7
8	B	V <sub>v</sub> , V <sub>w</sub> , V <sub>x</sub>	8

Here, for illustration, we have included the levels for one of the variables, "E", together with the run numbers, the measured values for  $V_{op}$ , and the totals for each run where, for example,  $\Sigma 1 = V_a + V_b + V_c$ .

Several types of averages are defined from these data. The "Grand Average", "GA" is defined as:

$$GA = \frac{\Sigma 1 + \Sigma 2 + \dots + \Sigma 8}{3 \times 8}$$

while the "Level Means",  $E_A$  and  $E_B$ , are defined as:

$$E_A = \frac{\Sigma 1 + \Sigma 2 + \Sigma 5 + \Sigma 6}{3 \times 4} \quad E_B = \frac{\Sigma 3 + \Sigma 4 + \Sigma 7 + \Sigma 8}{3 \times 4}$$

Similar level averages would be calculated for diodes,  $D_1$  and  $D_4$ , and for temperatures  $T_{LOW}$   $T_{HIGH}$ , in a similar way. Also, similar level averages would be calculated for the interactions  $D \times E$ ,  $D \times T$ ,  $E \times T$ , and  $D \times E \times T$ . These averages are used to determine the effects of factor level and interactions on  $V_{op}$ .

To determine the total effect of a particular factor on  $V_{op}$ , subtract the least level mean from the greatest. For example, if the level mean for  $D_1$  is greater than that for  $D_4$ , then the total effect for variable D is:







$$\begin{aligned} \text{Effect } D &= D_1 - D_4, \text{ or} \\ \text{Effect } D &= (D_1 - GA) - (D_4 - GA) \end{aligned}$$

if the level means are normalized to the Grand Average. Since the interactions are treated as if they were factors, the total effect of interaction  $D \times E$  is:

$$\text{Effect } D \times E = D \times E_1 - D \times E_2$$

assuming that  $D \times E_1$  is greater than  $D \times E_{II}$ . Of all of the factors and interactions calculated, the one with the largest total effect is the most important one, called the "control factor." Usually, the importance of the various factors and interactions can best be determined by graphing. An example of this is shown in on the following page.

## Graphing Results – Response Curves



Response curves  
give visual indication  
of factor and  
interaction effects

In the cases where these response curves have the largest slopes, the effects of the factors on the dependent variable are the largest. In the case they are relatively flat the factor does not affect the dependent variable as much. Also, the sign of the slope is important, as shown in the graphs.

In the case where an optimized value of the dependent variable is desired, often a maximized or minimized value for this variable, it is possible to predict the combination of factor levels that will produce this optimized result. As shown in the graphs, level 2 for factor D, level A for factor E, and level II for factor D X E each individually produce the largest values of  $V_{op}$ . If the highest value for  $V_{op}$  is considered optimum, these levels could be expected to produce the optimum level of  $V_{op}$ . That optimum level, with respect to these two factors and this one interaction, could be calculated as follows:

$$\text{Optimum } V_{op} = GA(D_4-GA) + (E_A-GA) + (D \times E_{II} - GA)$$

The full calculation would include all of the factors and interactions in an obvious way. The last step in the matrixed DOE process would be to perform an experimental run using the optimized values for the factor levels, and compare the measured value for the dependent variable with the predicted value.

ANOVA, or analysis of variance, is a mathematical procedure used to allocate the amount of variation resulting from each factor as well as the proportion of the total variation contributed by each factor. It is a useful method when sample to sample variation is observed in DOE studies with large numbers of samples. ANOVA techniques can help pinpoint those factors that are sources of variation in the results obtained from MTS-DOE studies, and which could be sources of variation in the final, manufactured product. Some definitions associated with ANOVA analyses are presented on the following pages as well as an example of ANOVA application to determine control limits for material properties. This latter document by Dr. Ajit Tamhane of Northwestern University is an analysis of several batches of silicone material tested at an outside laboratory and compared to the specification limits proposed by Emerson & Cuming, the material producer. Finally, a statistical test plan for characterizing a key material or component element is presented as an example of the type of evaluation that might be necessary to fully evaluate that elements' performance.

### 1.2.2 Analysis Of Variance (ANOVA)

ANOVA: is a method for comparing several groups of data to determine if a treatment is significant in relation to the residual error within the group. Anova uses the sum of squares and mean squares to determine significance.

Total sum of squares (SS) = error SS + treatment SS or:

$$\sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} (x_{ij} - \bar{x})^2 = \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} (x_{ij} - \bar{x}_i)^2 + \sum_{i=1}^k n_i (\bar{x}_i - \bar{x})^2$$

where  $x_{ij}$  = the individual records of the group

$\bar{x}$  = the grand average of the group

$\bar{x}_i$  = the average of the  $i^{\text{th}}$  subgroup

$n_i$  = the number of records within the  $i^{\text{th}}$  subgroup

Error, also called "within" sample variation, is a measure of the imprecision of testing, individual piece variation, etc. regardless of treatment. Treatment, or "between" variation, is the measure of the effect of a specific method or process being investigated.

Group: a collection of data records, ( $x_{ij}$ ), meeting defined criteria such as all the samples analyzed on 1-10-90 regardless of test site.

Subgroup: a set of records, ( $x_i$ ), obtained under identical conditions i.e. the same date, test site, conditioning parameters, etc.

Between DF(degrees of freedom): 1 less than the number of groups, ( $k$ ).

Within DF(degrees of freedom): the number of records within a group, ( $N = \sum n_i$ ), - the number of groups ( $i$ ).

Total DF: the number of records within a group, ( $N$ ), - 1

Between SS(Sum of Squares): the difference squared between the subgroup average and the grand or group average.

Within SS(Sum of Squares): the difference squared between the individual data records and the group average.

**Between MS(Mean Square):** the between SS ÷ the between degrees of freedom, (k-1). This estimates  $\sigma^2$ , the true variance of the treatment effects.

$$\frac{\left( \sum_{i=1}^k n_i (\bar{x}_i - \bar{x})^2 \right)}{k - 1}$$

**Within MS(Mean Square):** the within SS ÷ the within degrees of freedom, (N - k). This estimates the variation due to chance.

$$\frac{\left( \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} (x_{ij} - \bar{x}_i)^2 \right)}{N - k}$$

**F:** Between MS ÷ Within MS. If each the within and between degrees of freedom are at least 2, an F value greater than 20 is significant to 95 % confidence. As the degrees of freedom increase, the F value becomes significant at lower levels.

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF DATA ON PROPERTIES OF RED RUBBER  
AND ITS APPLICATION TO CALCULATE CONTROL LIMITS**  
(Test Site = Broutman, Batches = 30, 33, 47, 77, 99)

by Dr. Ajit C. Tamhane

A) ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

The basic model underlying the analysis of variance (ANOVA) is as follows in this case. For a given property  $X$  ( $X$  = Compressive Modulus, Tear Strength and Tensile Strength), let  $X_{ij}$  be the  $j$ th reading for the  $i$ th batch,  $i = 30, 33, 47, 77, 99; j = 1, 2, \dots, n_i$ ; where  $n_i$  is the sample size used for the  $i$ th batch. Then

$$X_{ij} = \text{Batch Mean } \mu_i + \text{Measurement Error } e_{ij}$$

and

$$\text{Variance}(X_{ij}) = \text{Variance}(\mu_i) + \text{Variance}(e_{ij}).$$

The above equation is symbolically expressed as

$$\sigma_{\text{total}}^2 = \sigma_{\text{batch}}^2 + \sigma_{\text{error}}^2.$$

The ANOVA enables us to obtain estimates of  $\sigma_{\text{batch}}^2$  and  $\sigma_{\text{error}}^2$  using the formulas

$$\sigma_{\text{error}}^2 = \text{MSerror}$$

and

$$\sigma_{\text{batch}}^2 = (\text{MSbatch} - \text{MSerror}) / n$$

where  $n$  is the (average) sample size per batch (assuming that the  $n$ 's for different batches are not too different). The ANOVA also gives an  $F$ -statistic,

$$F = \frac{\text{MSbatch}}{\text{MSerror}}$$

which can be used to test whether there is a significant between batch (batch-to-batch) variation.

Before performing the ANOVA, any outliers were removed using the ASTM Standard Practice for Dealing with Outlier Observations (E 178-80). The final results are summarized below.

1) Compressive Modulus:

The summary statistics for batches are as follows.

Batch	$n$	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Dev.
30	24	794.10	855.70	818.53	17.06
33	24	866.04	1615.44	1176.58	190.71
47	24	772.00	945.23	866.70	43.03
77	23	925.00	1094.00	1003.22	46.18
99	23	774.00	967.00	891.09	44.39
Total	118	772.00	1615.44	951.29	92.32

We see that Batch 33 has unusually high mean and high standard deviation. Therefore this batch was dropped from further calculations.

The ANOVA table is as follows.

#### Analysis of Variance

Source	Sum of Squares (SS)	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Squares (MS)	F	p-value
Batches	429144.51	3	14048.17	92.26	.0001
Error	139538.91	90	1550.43		
Total	568683.42	93			

From this we obtain the following estimates. (Avg.  $n = 23.6$ .)

$$\sigma_{\text{error}}^2 = 1550.43, \sigma_{\text{batch}}^2 = 6021.18.$$

2) Tear Strength:

The summary statistics for batches are as follows.

Batch	n	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Dev.
30	24	24.20	29.50	26.75	1.27
33	28	26.20	30.60	28.18	1.16
47	28	26.60	32.10	29.29	1.28
77	24	30.90	36.50	33.05	1.42
99	20	25.10	30.60	27.72	1.27
Total	124	24.20	36.50	29.02	1.28

The ANOVA table is as follows.

#### Analysis of Variance

Source	Sum of Squares (SS)	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Squares (MS)	F	p-value
Batches	569.67	4	142.42	87.08	.0001
Error	194.63	119	1.64		
Total	764.29	123			

From this we obtain the following estimates. (Avg.  $n = 24.8$ .)

$$\sigma_{\text{error}}^2 = 1.64, \sigma_{\text{batch}}^2 = 5.68.$$

3) Tensile Strength:

The summary statistics for batches are as follows.

Batch	n	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Dev.
30	19	552.38	690.37	632.06	33.87
33	17	576.00	641.60	612.56	16.53
47	19	571.90	670.50	628.94	28.36
77	22	569.60	633.30	602.09	18.06
99	20	537.10	613.60	586.75	21.10
Total	97	537.10	690.37	611.89	24.41

The ANOVA table is as follows.

#### Analysis of Variance

Source	Sum of Squares (SS)	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Squares (MS)	F	p-value
Batches	28019.06	4	7004.77	11.76	.0001
Error	54800.03	92	595.65		
Total	82819.09	96			

From this we obtain the following estimates. (Avg.  $n = 19.4$ .)

$$\sigma_{\text{error}}^2 = 595.65, \sigma_{\text{batch}}^2 = 330.37.$$

#### B) CALCULATION OF CONTROL LIMITS

The control limits will be based on the mean computed from  $n = 10$  measurements for each property. For a given property  $X$ , denote this mean by  $\bar{X}$ . Then it is well-known that

$$\text{Variance}(\bar{X}) = \sigma^2 = \sigma_{\text{batch}}^2 + \sigma_{\text{error}}^2/n.$$

The control limits are then given by

$$\bar{\bar{X}} \pm 3\sigma,$$

where  $\bar{\bar{X}}$  denotes the overall average of past batches that were in statistical control. The calculation of these control limits for the three properties is shown in the following table.

Property	$\bar{X}$	$\sigma_{\text{batch}}$	$\sigma_{\text{error}}$	$\sigma$	Control Limits
Compressive Modulus	893.77	77.60	39.38	78.59	[658.00, 1129.54]
Tear Strength	29.02	2.38	1.28	2.42	[21.77, 36.27]
Tensile Strength	611.89	18.18	24.41	19.75	[552.65, 671.13]

#### C) TOLERANCE LIMITS PROPOSED BY E & C

Mr. Kevin Yee of E & C has proposed to use 95-99 tolerance limits (95% probability that the means (based on 10 measurements) of the 99% of all future batches will fall within these limits) as the specification limits for tensile strength and tear strength. The following points should be noted regarding this proposal.

- We should not lose sight of the fact that the specification limits must come from engineering or design considerations. At present we do not have such a basis available for deciding the specification limits, hence the resort to using the control limits or the tolerance limits in their place. The latter do not guarantee that the part will function properly. The only thing they check is whether the variation from the past average is within statistical limits.
- The tolerance limits are generally far too wide to be useful in application if based on so few batches. They permit excessive variation.
- The E & C calculations do not separate the contributions to the total variation from between batches and within batches (which is essentially variation due to measurement errors, assuming each batch is quite homogeneous). The standard deviation  $S$  that they calculate estimates  $\sigma = \sqrt{\sigma_{\text{batch}}^2 + \sigma_{\text{error}}^2/n}$ , but not its components. Also it is based on too few batches, and hence not a very reliable estimate. The separate components give useful information.

## D) GAGE STUDY

The gage study data provided by Broutman was analyzed using ANOVA techniques. There are two factors: 1) Operator, and 2) Sheet. Both factors are regarded as random. The location on the sheet is a possible factor, but not sufficient data are available to study the effects of location. Therefore the following model was considered:

$$X_{ijk} = \mu + \alpha_i + \beta_j + \epsilon_{ijk}$$

where  $X_{ijk}$  is the  $k$ th measurement on the  $j$ th sheet by the  $i$ th operator ( $i = 1, 2, 3, j = 1, 2, 3, 4, k = 1, 2, \dots, n_{ij}$ ),  $\mu$  is the overall mean,  $\alpha_i$  is the "effect" of the  $i$ th operator ( $i = 1, 2, 3$ ),  $\beta_j$  is the "effect" of the  $j$ th sheet ( $j = 1, 2, 3, 4$ ) and  $\epsilon_{ijk}$  is the measurement error corresponding to this measurement. The total variance can be partitioned as

$$\text{Variance}(X_{ijk}) = \sigma_{\text{total}}^2 = \sigma_{\text{operator}}^2 + \sigma_{\text{sheet}}^2 + \sigma_{\text{error}}^2.$$

The results are as follows.

1) Elongation: The ANOVA table is as follows.

Analysis of Variance

Source	Sum of Squares (SS)	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Squares (MS)	F	p-value
Operator	468.19	2	234.09	4.05	.0231
Sheet	35.91	3	11.97	0.21	.8912
Error	3124.45	54	57.86		
Total	3628.54	59			

The conclusion here is that there are significant differences between the operators, but the sheets do not differ significantly. Operators 1 and 2 are quite close in their measurements (their means are 82.68 and 82.07, respectively), and also have about the same variation (their SD's are 6.70 and 5.56, respectively), but Operator 2 has higher mean = 88.28 and higher SD = 9.51. The variance components are estimated to be

$$\sigma_{\text{error}}^2 = 57.86, \sigma_{\text{operator}}^2 = 8.82, \sigma_{\text{sheet}}^2 = 0.$$

2) Tensile Strength: The ANOVA table is as follows.

Analysis of Variance

Source	Sum of Squares (SS)	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Squares (MS)	F	p-value
Operator	178.54	2	89.27	0.12	.8876
Sheet	978.41	3	326.14	0.44	.7279
Error	40357.73	54	747.37		
Total	41514.69	59			

The conclusion here is that there are no significant differences between either the operators or the sheets. The operator means are quite close (560.40, 557.78 and 561.96, respectively). Their SD's are 18.00, 36.45 and 22.87. Note that Operator 2 again has the highest variation. The variance components are estimated to be

$$\sigma_{\text{error}}^2 = 747.37, \sigma_{\text{operator}}^2 = 0, \sigma_{\text{sheet}}^2 = 0.$$

### 3) Tensile Modulus:

The ANOVA table is as follows.

Analysis of Variance

Source	Sum of Squares (SS)	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Squares (MS)	F	p-value
Operator	64932.58	2	32466.29	9.11	.0004
Sheet	12802.68	3	4267.56	1.20	.3913
Error	192376.74	54	3562.53		
Total	270112.01	59			

The conclusion here is that there are significant differences between the operators, but the sheets do not differ significantly. Operators 1 and 3 are relatively close in their measurements (their means are 726.75 and 752.12, respectively); Operator 1 has SD = 44.96 and Operator 3 has SD = 29.88. Operator 2 has much lower mean = 673.20 and the highest SD = 88.79. The variance components are estimated to be

$$\sigma_{\text{error}}^2 = 3562.53, \sigma_{\text{operator}}^2 = 1080.91, \sigma_{\text{sheet}}^2 = 47.00$$

On the whole, sheets are fairly homogeneous (because they are made from the same batch), but the operators do differ from each other; the differences are mainly due to Operator 2, whose measurements differ from those of Operators 1 and 3, and who has the highest variation in each case.

### 1.2.3 Statistical Test Plan For Characterizing Materials And Components

#### Introduction

It is essential that any experimental results of this manufacturing technology program be reproducible and validatable by other HVPS manufacturers or interested organizations. Conclusions must be sound in accordance with proven statistical techniques.

With this as a goal, such things as sample size, success criteria, and desired level of confidence must be established prior to conducting the test programs. To attack the problem of determining such things as sample size when there is no existing reliable data, several assumptions must be made. Factors such as type of data distribution and repeatability of a test method (including the equipment and operator) must be estimated in order to develop a reasonable plan. Such things as accuracy of test results can be assured by verifying the results from a primary test site at a secondary test site. If there is significant disagreement between the two, a third or referee test site may be needed.

#### General Development

It is assumed that material and component properties or some transformation of them (i.e. log or inverse) are distributed normally. However lifetime data (MTBF) is assumed to be distributed exponentially. These initial assumptions will be verified and modified as necessary as the first test results are evaluated.

#### Material Plan

##### Sample Size

For the initial runs assume that the test method is repeatable within  $\pm 10\%$  of the true mean ( $\mu$ ) value and that if the appropriate number of samples are tested, the average value ( $x\bar{}$ ) will be within  $\pm 2\%$  of the true mean.

To determine the appropriate sample size, the following standard will be used:

$$n = \left( \frac{Z * \sigma}{a} \right)^2$$

(equation 1)

where      n= number of samples  
z= critical value from the Standard Normal Distribution corresponding to the chosen confidence interval  
a= margin of error for  $\mu$   
 $\sigma$ = sigma, the true standard deviation for the population from which the samples are drawn

Since sigma is the standard deviation of an infinite population and therefore unknown, it must be estimated by using the fact that in a normal distribution; 68% of the population fall within  $\pm 1\sigma$ , 95% of the population fall into  $\pm 2\sigma$ , and 99.7% fall into the  $\pm 3\sigma$  range.

Taking a conservative approach,  $\sigma$  is estimated as the total range of test values, R, divided by 4. The range is divided by 4 rather than 6 since there is so little gain in probability between  $\pm 2\sigma$  and  $\pm 3\sigma$ . Dividing by 6 then, might define an insufficient sample size. Especially for the initial attempts, it is better to err on the side of caution. Thus the equation becomes:

$$n = \left( \frac{R * Z}{4 * \bar{\sigma}} \right)^2$$

(equation 2)

Once the initial testing is complete it may become crucial to reevaluate any preliminary assumptions. If the sample range is greater than 20% of the sample average, it would be desirable to examine the test method, equipment, technique, etc., to determine if there are any attributable causes for the sample variation. If any cause of variance can be identified, it should be corrected and another set of samples run. If attributable cause cannot be found, then the initial assumption, that the range is within  $\pm 10\%$  of the mean, must be rejected. If any known attributable cause is not eliminated, then the set will not be random and cannot be used to approximate a normal distribution.

If the testing shows a lesser variation than assumed, the number of samples necessary can be reduced or a higher confidence level assigned.

Note that if the sample size  $n$  is prohibitively large, a different set of parameters may need to be established. For values of  $n$  at other conditions, see Tables 1 and 2.

Once the testing is complete for any given parameter, the sample average ( $\bar{x}$ ) and sample standard deviation ( $S$ ) will be calculated. These results are a measure of the precision of the test method and are denoted as "within" calculations.

Once the "within" sample variation has been determined, "between", or batch to batch limits can be set. Because of the slow rate of manufacture, the number of samples is predetermined. Every batch must be tested. For consistency, five batches will be tested as a compromise between precision and timeliness. Five sample batches will allow for a 90% confidence if the range is not more than 5.42 times greater than the margin of error. This can be seen from equation 2) when the appropriate substitutions are made.

$$S = \left[ \frac{R + 1.65}{\frac{4}{2} + \bar{s}} \right]^2 = \left[ \frac{R}{\bar{s}} + 0.4125 \right]^2$$

$$\frac{R}{\bar{s}} = \frac{\sqrt{5}}{0.4125} = 5.42$$

### Significance

In the "between" part of the consistency phase, "a" will be defined as the standard deviation of the "within" sample testing. Therefore any statements about consistency are accurate within the test method variation.  $\bar{x}$ -bar and  $S$  will be calculated for each batch data set. The significance of any differences within certain confidence levels will be tested with pooled data calculations (t-test for mean and F-test for variance). The equation for the t-test is:

$$|t| = \frac{|\bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2|}{\sqrt{\frac{(n_1-1)S_1^2 + (n_2-1)S_2^2}{(n_1-1) + (n_2-1)} + \sqrt{\frac{1}{n_1} + \frac{1}{n_2}}}}$$

(equation

3)

The calculated  $t$  value would then be compared to a table  $t$  value,  $t_{(v,\alpha)}$ , where  $v = (n_1-1) + (n_2-1)$ , and  $\alpha = 1 -$

TABLE 1 SAMPLE SIZE AT VARIOUS RANGE AND ERROR VALUES

z= 1.65 (90% confidence)

Range as a percent of  $\mu$ 

$\backslash R$	5%	10%	20%	25%	50%	100%
$a \backslash$						
1%	4.3	17.0	68.1	106.3	425.4	1701.6
2%	1.1	4.3	17.0	26.6	106.3	425.4
3%	0.5	1.9	7.6	11.8	47.3	189.1
4%	0.3	1.1	4.3	6.6	26.6	106.3
5%	0.2	0.7	2.7	4.3	17.0	68.1
6%	0.1	0.5	1.9	3.0	11.8	47.3
7%	0.1	0.3	1.4	2.2	8.7	34.7
8%	0.1	0.3	1.1	1.7	6.6	26.6
9%	0.1	0.2	0.8	1.3	5.3	21.0
10%	0.0	0.2	0.7	1.1	4.3	17.0
11%	0.0	0.1	0.6	0.9	3.5	14.1
12%	0.0	0.1	0.5	0.7	3.0	11.8
13%	0.0	0.1	0.4	0.6	2.5	10.1
14%	0.0	0.1	0.3	0.5	2.2	8.7
15%	0.0	0.1	0.3	0.5	1.9	7.6
20%	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.3	1.1	4.3
25%	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.7	2.7

TABLE 2 SAMPLE SIZE AT VARIOUS RANGE AND ERROR VALUES

z= 1.96 (95% confidence)

Range as a percent of u

$\alpha$ as % u	\R	5%	10%	20%	25%	50%	100%
1%	6.0	24.0	96.0	150.1	600.3	2401.0	
2%	1.5	6.0	24.0	37.5	150.1	600.3	
3%	0.7	2.7	10.7	16.7	66.7	266.8	
4%	0.4	1.5	6.0	9.4	37.5	150.1	
5%	0.2	1.0	3.8	6.0	24.0	96.0	
6%	0.2	0.7	2.7	4.2	16.7	66.7	
7%	0.1	0.5	2.0	3.1	12.2	49.0	
8%	0.1	0.4	1.5	2.3	9.4	37.5	
9%	0.1	0.3	1.2	1.9	7.4	29.6	
10%	0.1	0.2	1.0	1.5	6.0	24.0	
11%	0.0	0.2	0.8	1.2	5.0	19.8	
12%	0.0	0.2	0.7	1.0	4.2	16.7	
13%	0.0	0.1	0.6	0.9	3.6	14.2	
14%	0.0	0.1	0.5	0.8	3.1	12.2	
15%	0.0	0.1	0.4	0.7	2.7	10.7	
20%	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.4	1.5	6.0	
25%	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.2	1.0	3.8	

confidence. If  $t_{\text{calc}} > t_{(\nu, \alpha)}$  then the samples are significantly different.

The t-test assumes that  $\sigma_1 = \sigma_2$ . To test this hypothesis, an F-test is used. The equation for this is:

$$F = \frac{S^2_1}{S^2_2} \quad \text{if } S^2_1 \geq S^2_2$$

$$F = \frac{S^2_2}{S^2_1} \quad \text{if } S^2_1 < S^2_2$$

Where  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  are the sample deviations,  $S^2_1$  and  $S^2_2$  are the sample variances, and  $\sigma$  is the population (or infinite) standard deviation. If  $F \leq F(\nu_{\text{numerator}}, \nu_{\text{denominator}})$  at some  $\alpha$ , then the hypothesis that  $\sigma_1 = \sigma_2$  may be accepted at a level of significance  $\alpha$ , and the above t-test is applicable.

#### Success Criteria

If the range of means(x-bars) for the "between" batch tests of any property is greater than  $5.42 * \sigma$  the material will be determined to be inconsistent with respect to the parameter being tested. A material may be inconsistent in some properties but consistent in others.

At this point, the consistency data will be communicated to the vendor who may then choose to improve his process and product. If the vendor does choose to improve the consistency of his product, the product should be retested to reflect improved processing. If the vendor chooses not to reduce the variability, the data will stand as is.

#### Characterization

With test data available, the sample size for characterization testing will be recalculated using the "within" sample mean ( $x$ -bar) and standard deviation ( $S$ ). the equation for this is similar to equation 2.

Since  $S$  is known,  $n$  can be recalculated for less variable

$$n = \left( \frac{Z * S}{\alpha} \right)^2$$

parameters since a smaller number of test samples will furnish the desired confidence. Under no condition will less than three samples be run. For each property determined, an average, a standard deviation and a confidence level will be calculated and published.

#### Component Test Plan

Component testing involves at least two types of distribution, normal for component properties and Weibull for component life testing. Note that a normal distribution assumes that once infant failures have occurred, the performance is time dependant until wear-out occurs (the bath tub curve); whereas, a Weibull distribution is based on a mechanism which produces time dependant life. In the case of high voltage hardware for example, corona discharge could be that mechanism since the discharge produces cumulative damage to insulating systems. The treatments for each follow.

#### Life testing

One of the most significant attributes of any component or unit is its working life or Mean Time Between Failure (MTBF). Since this life data is usually not normal in distribution, the assumptions and equations used above are no longer applicable. Instead life data may be assumed to be a type of Weibull distribution. For the initial estimations the data is assumed to be exponential (a Weibull distribution having shape parameter  $\beta=1$ ) to simplify some of the calculations.

#### Sample Size

To estimate the number of samples required for life testing, the equation is:

$$r = n * p$$

r = the number of failures

n = the number of samples run

p = the proportion of failure =  $1 - e^{-\lambda T}$

T = the time of test termination

$\lambda = (\text{MTBF})^{-1}$

Since none of this is known, it is essential to assume preliminary values. To achieve a reasonable confidence in the estimated MTBF, it is necessary to observe a high number of failures. To accomplish this, either a large number of samples must be tested or the failure proportion term must be made large by making T larger. If the test items are expensive and/or difficult to obtain, increasing T is the more practical method.

For example, if the expected MTBF is 2000 hours, and ten units are available for test:

$$r = n * \left( 1 - e^{-\frac{T}{MTBF_{expected}}} \right)$$
$$\frac{r}{n} = 1 - e^{-\frac{T}{MTBF_{expected}}}$$
$$7 - 1 = -e^{-\frac{T}{2000}} \quad (\text{for } r=7 \text{ which is "large"})$$

$$e^{-\frac{T}{2000}} = 0.3$$

$$\frac{-T}{2000} = \ln(0.3)$$

$$T = 2408 \text{ hours}$$

To get a reasonable chance of observing 7 failures, the test must run at least 2408 hours. More time will allow for greater confidence.

If time is not the limiting quantity, the sample size,  $n$ , may be estimated using equation 5. By deciding the test termination time,  $t_0$ , e.g., 3000 hours, and substituting, the equation becomes:

$$7 = n \left( 1 - e^{-\frac{3000}{2000}} \right) \text{ or } n = 9.0105$$

Since at least 7 observed failures are needed, the sample size is rounded up to 10.

#### MTBF and Confidence

After the test has been completed, then the estimated MTBF

( $MTBF_{est}$ ) may be calculated from:

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^r t_i + (n - r) t_0}{r}$$

where  $t_i$  = the observed failure times

$t_0$  = the time of test termination

To be sure that the true MTBF ( $\mu$ ) is captured by a confidence interval around the MTBF<sub>est</sub> with desired probability, a confidence level must be fixed and the limits calculated. For a time truncated test, the limits are:

$$\frac{2 + r}{\chi^2_{2r, 1 - \frac{\alpha}{2}}} * MTBF_{est} = lower\ limit$$

$$\frac{2 + r}{\chi^2_{2r, 1 - \frac{\alpha}{2}}} * MTBF_{est} = upper\ limit$$

If the desired confidence is 90%, then  $\alpha = .10$ , the probability that MTBF will fall outside the confidence limits. The probability of being outside the confidence limits is equal on either the upper or lower end, or .05 for each. Using the previous example and substituting the values, the limits become:


$$\frac{2 + 7}{\chi^2_{14, .95}} * MTBF_{est} = \frac{14}{23.68} * MTBF_{est} = lower$$

$$\frac{2 + 7}{\chi^2_{14, .05}} * MTBF_{est} = \frac{14}{6.571} * MTBF_{est} = upper$$

For any experimental data, the confidence level and the confidence interval will be identified. Note: The values 23.68 and 6.572 in the above equations are from the Chi-Squared distribution table (see next page). For the number of failures,  $r=7$ , the Chi Squared values are located in the  $2r$  line and under the .95 and .05 columns (which represent +/- .05 or  $\alpha=.1$ ).

### Life Testing

Life tests will be performed under a variety of stresses such as temperature and vibration. The results obtained will then be correlated, if possible, to actual lifetime. The sample size will be calculated as above with possible differences in assumed MTBF and confidence levels adopted.


Appendix III Percentage Points of the  $\chi^2$  Distribution<sup>a</sup>

$v$	$\alpha$								
	0.995	0.990	0.975	0.950	0.500	0.050	0.025	0.010	0.005
1	0.00 +	0.00 +	0.00 +	0.00 +	0.45	3.84	5.02	6.63	7.88
2	0.01	0.02	0.05	0.10	1.39	5.99	7.38	9.21	10.60
3	0.07	0.11	0.22	0.35	2.37	7.81	9.35	11.34	12.84
4	0.21	0.30	0.48	0.71	3.36	9.49	11.14	13.28	14.86
5	0.41	0.55	0.83	1.15	4.35	11.07	12.38	15.09	16.75
6	0.68	0.87	1.24	1.64	5.35	12.59	14.45	16.81	18.55
7	0.99	1.24	1.69	2.17	6.35	14.07	16.01	18.48	20.28
8	1.34	1.65	2.18	2.73	7.34	15.51	17.53	20.09	21.96
9	1.73	2.09	2.70	3.33	8.34	16.92	19.02	21.67	23.59
10	2.16	2.56	3.25	3.94	9.34	18.31	20.48	23.21	25.19
11	2.60	3.05	3.82	4.57	10.34	19.68	21.92	24.72	26.76
12	3.07	3.57	4.40	5.23	11.34	21.03	23.34	26.22	28.30
13	3.57	4.11	5.01	5.89	12.34	22.36	24.74	27.69	29.82
14	4.07	4.66	5.63	6.57	13.34	23.68	26.12	29.14	31.32
15	4.60	5.23	6.27	7.26	14.34	25.00	27.49	30.58	32.80
16	5.14	5.81	6.91	7.96	15.34	26.30	28.85	32.00	34.27
17	5.70	6.41	7.56	8.67	16.34	27.59	30.19	33.41	35.72
18	6.26	7.01	8.23	9.39	17.34	28.87	31.53	34.81	37.16
19	6.84	7.63	8.91	10.12	18.34	30.14	32.85	36.19	38.58
20	7.43	8.26	9.59	10.85	19.34	31.41	34.17	37.57	40.00
25	10.52	11.52	13.12	14.61	24.34	37.65	40.65	44.31	46.93
30	13.79	14.95	16.79	18.49	29.34	43.77	46.98	50.89	53.67
40	20.71	22.16	24.43	26.51	39.34	55.76	59.34	63.69	66.77
50	27.99	29.71	32.36	34.76	49.33	67.50	71.42	76.15	79.49
60	35.53	37.48	40.48	43.19	59.33	79.08	83.30	88.38	91.95
70	43.28	45.44	48.76	51.74	69.33	90.53	95.02	100.42	104.22
80	51.17	53.54	57.15	60.39	79.33	101.88	106.63	112.33	116.32
90	59.20	61.75	65.65	69.13	89.33	113.14	118.14	124.12	128.30
100	67.33	70.06	74.22	77.93	99.33	124.34	129.56	135.81	140.17


<sup>a</sup> = degrees of freedom.

<sup>a</sup> Adapted with permission from *Biometrika Tables for Statisticians*, Vol. 1, 3rd ed., by E. S. Pearson and H. O. Hartley, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1966.

Probability Density Function  
 $y=\text{chi2}(x, 14)$



Probability Density Function  
 $y=\text{chi2}(x, 14)$



### 1.3 HVPS Design and Packaging Considerations

Rigorous HVPS design requires a team effort that includes electrical, mechanical, materials and systems engineering people. The fundamental concurrent engineering tool to be used by this multi-functional design team is QFD. Through the use of the QFD forms and process, the full set of requirements can be considered together, and technical, cost, and schedule risks areas can be identified. Highlighted problems can often be studied and solved using MTS-DOE methods. Proper implementation of requirements at all conceptual levels of the power supply, from highest level of the system as a whole, down to the level of the individual components and materials used, is the most important task of the design team. The Manufacturing Technology for High Voltage Power Supplies program had as a major goal the development and demonstration of these techniques, and they are presented later in this report.

While the focus of the program was not on electrical design, there are specific, technical considerations that enter into a power supply's overall packaging and electrical designs that are of great importance. Isolating the high voltage circuitry in the supply from its low voltage circuitry is important to minimize noise and coupling. Also, routing of high voltage and low voltage leads should be planned to minimize the number of interconnects. Interconnects represent potential sources of noise, spurious rectifying junctions, and mechanical failure. High voltage leads should be short, and routed to minimize inductance, and the effects of coupled signals.

The high voltage assembly should be designed for the unobstructed flow of the potting material, and the viscosity of the potting material during the pouring and filling process should be considered when laying out the power supply's components, and establishing spacings between components, between components and structural members, and between components and the mold walls. Minimizing bubbles and voids in the high voltage areas is critical to power supply performance and reliability. Potting molds should be designed for free and unobstructed flow of potting material during encapsulation, and for ease of removal from the potted assembly. The mold should be designed with the thought in mind to minimize mechanical strains induced into the potted assembly as the mold is removed -thus avoiding formation of cracks or crack precursors in the materials.

When printed wiring boards (PWBs) are used, adequate spacing between PWB traces carrying different voltages, should be maintained in order to minimize the possibility of arcing and breakdown during operation. The surface of the PWB acts as a natural pathway for conduction, and good adhesion between the potting material and the PWB materials is important. The particular PWB materials used are also important, since the fibers in the PWB mat also represent surfaces along which electrical charge can travel.

The coefficient of thermal coefficient (CTE) of all materials in the assembly should be considered during the design process, along with their compatibility with each other, and their ability to bond to each other, and to the components in the supply. Since

materials selection can affect critical aspects of electrical design, packaging design, component selection, selection of other materials, process selection, and testing, this important design aspect should be considered by the entire multifunctional team, and not just left up to one materials engineer.

Adequate stress relief should be provided for all component leads and wiring. This is particularly true in the case of very fine wires, such as those used in some transformers. The thermal cycling of power supplies during operation has been shown to place such wires under mechanical stress. Under such conditions, stress may be concentrated in a specific area of the wire, which then necks down as a result of grain size change due to stress action, strain hardening etc. Wire failure is the last step in this process. Finally, thermal analyses should be performed to assure adequate heat transfer in the supply to prevent overheating, followed by material or component failure.

Important electrical design considerations include the use of E-field analyses to reveal potential problems with neighboring circuitry, and potential problems in the supply itself, including excessive voltage stresses. Where necessary, electrostatic shielding of sensitive circuitry in and near the HVPS should be planned in the design. Power supply turn-on and turn-off should be controlled in such a way as to prevent large transient voltages from stressing power supply components or components in circuitry attached to the supply. In the transformer, core saturation at high temperature is an issue that must be considered in the design. For HVPSs powering traveling wave tubes (TWTs), limiting the arc current in the supply to the extent practical is also important to protect the supply's components against damage due to severe voltage transients. A related component issue that affects the design is the stability of voltage divider resistors after output arcing. Also, in such applications it is wise to design the HVPS in such a way as to decouple sensitive I/O signals from the effects of arcing and corona discharge, to the maximum extent possible. HVPSs may be subjected to varying levels of humidity, or even to moisture in some applications. The potential effects of moisture and electrostatic effects on high impedance circuitry must be carefully considered in the electrical design, packaging design, and in the selection of components that may potentially be affected, including connectors.

When HVPSs are used to power TWTs, tube arcing can place severe stresses on the power supply. The design should ensure survivability under these conditions. Observed effects of TWT arcing on power supplies include the effects on feedback dividers, effects on control circuitry, and arcs in secondary loads resulting from arcing in the primary load.

Voltage stresses must be a primary concern in HVPS design. A wide range of difficulties are created when HVPS designs incorporate high voltage stresses in individual components, or in the packaging design layout. Arcing, corona discharge, and dielectric breakdown are frequently observed in HVPSs where high voltage stresses are present. These effects, in turn, can cause intermittent or continuous electrical faults, and they can destroy components and encapsulation materials.

Defect growth in regions of high voltage stress is often observed during operation, and catastrophic breakdown of a portion of the supply is not uncommon.

The presence of high voltage stresses places severe demands and restrictions upon component design, component materials, impregnation and encapsulation materials, and impregnation and encapsulation processes. Careful processing to avoid the formation of voids or bubbles in impregnants and encapsulants is especially critical. The use of heavily filled encapsulants may be necessary to achieve certain thermal conductivity and/or CTE (Co-efficient of Thermal Expansion) properties, however, a high percentage of fillers in the encapsulation material also increases its viscosity. Depending upon the packaging design, this may make it difficult to completely eliminate all voids in the potting in regions of the high voltage stress. Under such conditions, an encapsulation MTS, a mockup of the power supply layout which can be encapsulated and then dissected to look for voids in regions of known high voltage stress, is an important step in the design process.

The following set of tables highlight the above discussion and should be used as a reference in the design and/or manufacturing process for HVPSs. Table 4 lists several stress limits for design reference. The conservative limits should be the first design choice. Finally, a test plan to exercise the HVPS via environmental cycling at various operating conditions is critical to establishing long term reliability.

Table 1 ELECTRICAL DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS

**E FIELD ANALYSIS**

**LIMIT ARC CURRENT TO EXTENT PRACTICAL**

**ELECTROSTATIC SHIELDING OF SENSITIVE CIRCUITRY IN AND NEAR THE HVPS**

**CONTROLLED TURN-ON/TURN-OFF**

**CORE SATURATION AT HIGH TEMPERATURE**

**DECOUPLING OF SENSITIVE I/O SIGNALS FROM EFFECTS OF ARCING AND CORONA**

**PIN TO CASE VOLTAGE BREAKDOWN OF ACTIVE DEVICES**

**MOISTURE AND ELECTROSTATIC EFFECTS ON HIGH IMPEDANCE CIRCUITRY**

**DIVIDER RESISTOR STABILITY AFTER OUTPUT ARCING**

Table 2. MECHANICAL DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS

ISOLATE HIGH VOLTAGE CIRCUITRY FROM LOW VOLTAGE CIRCUITRY  
PLAN ROUTING OF HIGH VOLTAGE AND LOW VOLTAGE LEADS TO  
MINIMIZE NUMBER OF INTERCONNECTS  
MINIMIZE INDUCTANCE OF HIGH CURRENT LEADS  
DESIGN HIGH VOLTAGE ASSEMBLY FOR UNOBSTRUCTED FLOW OF  
POTTING MATERIAL  
DESIGN POTTING MOLDS FOR FREE FLOW OF POTTING MATERIAL AND  
EASE OF FROM THE POTTED ASSEMBLY  
ADEQUATE SPACING FOR DIFFERENTIAL VOLTAGE ON PWBS  
CONSIDER CTE OF ALL MATERIALS IN HV ASSEMBLY  
ADEQUATE STRESS RELIEF FOR LEADS  
DESIGN HV ASSEMBLY FOR REPAIRABILITY  
THERMAL ANALYSIS TO ENSURE ADEQUATE HEAT TRANSFER

Table 3. DESIGN TIPS / CHECK LIST

ENSURE TOTAL IN-SYSTEM PERFORMANCE UNDER ALL POSSIBLE OPERATION CONDITIONS

PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED

CONTROL LOOP STABILITY FOR ALL COMBINATIONS OF LINE, LOAD AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS  
TURN-ON/TURN-OFF ANOMALIES  
CORE SATURATION AT MAXIMUM OPERATING TEMPERATURE AND LINE CONDITIONS  
RANDOM UNWANTED "ON" OR "OFF" COMMANDS  
INTERMITTENT FAULTS (MUST BE RECONCILED)  
CONNECTOR ARCING AT ALTITUDE AND COLD TEMPERATURE  
LOCALIZED HOT SPOTS IN HV ASSEMBLY

ENSURE SURVIVABILITY UNDER ALL POSSIBLE "ABNORMAL" CONDITIONS

TWT ARCING

STACKED OUTPUT VOLTAGES WITHIN LIMITS  
EFFECT ON FEEDBACK DIVIDER  
EFFECT ON CONTROL CIRCUITRY  
SECONDARY LOAD ARCS RESULTING FROM PRIMARY ARC

Table 4. OPERATING STRESS LIMITS

	Conservative Limits	Special Conditions
POWER DENSITY (WATTS/IN <sup>3</sup> )	20	>60
MAX TRANSFORMER TEMPERATURE (DEG. C)	125-150	125-150
BULK LINEAR VOLTAGE STRESS (VOLTS/MIL)	50	100
BULK RADIAL UTILIZATION FACTOR	2:1	5:1
BULK MAXIMUM FIELD STRESS (VOLTS/MIL)	100-300	300-1000

## 2.0 Characteristics Of Encapsulants

### 2.1 Introduction

The ideal characteristics of a high voltage power supply encapsulant (Table 1 for example) are not found in any single material. The three most common encapsulants, epoxy, silicone and urethane have been categorized in this section according to properties that are significant for use in high voltage applications. Each of the materials has attributes that make it a selectable material; however, performance in the application is necessary to validate the choice.

Encapsulants also have an added difficulty (compared to electrical components as an example) in that it is likely that batch to batch variation (essentially product consistency) will be a factor complicating measurement of material properties. During the course of this program, silicone shipment to shipment "variations" had to be understood and certain characteristic properties identified as useful indicators of consistency before true characterizing of the material could be accomplished. The consistency testing included the need to involve 3rd party testing laboratories because of differences in test methods and equipment at supplier and user sites. Details are addressed in Volume 3 of these guidelines and in the final program report (volume 1).

Table 1

Characteristic	Attribute
1. High Voltage	1. High CIV, CEV; High electric field strength; Corona Resistance
2. High heat Transfer function	2. High thermal conductivity; high electric field strength
3. Low electrical losses	3. High volume / surface resistivities; low dissipation factor; low dielectric constant
4. Adherent	4. Adherent to surfaces of components <sup>A</sup> ND construction materials
5. Processible	5. Low viscosity and surface tension; adequate pot-life / Gel time; reasonable cure conditions
6. Repairable	6. Reasonably removed; replacement does not compromise function, quality
7. Mechanical Adequacy	7. Variable depending on function / requirements

## 2.2 Material Comparisons

Table 2 qualitatively compares key properties of the materials. As noted, fillers affect thermal performance. They also affect other properties such as CTE. For example, a common filler for silicone is Alumina which reduces CTE while improving thermal conductivity. Table 3 provides further comparison details on some specific epoxy and urethane materials that have been considered for high voltage applications.

Table 2

PARAMETER	MATERIAL				
	IDEAL	RIGID EPOXY	FLEXIBILIZED EPOXY	FLEXIBILIZED POLYURETHANE	SILICONE
VISCOSITY	LOW	LOW	LOW TO MEDIUM	MEDIUM	MEDIUM TO HIGH
VOLTAGE CAPABILITY	HIGH	HIGH	LOW	LOW	MEDIUM
REPAIRABILITY	EASY	DIFFICULT	FAIRLY EASY	EASY	EASY
GLASS TRANSITION TEMPERATURE	LOW	MEDIUM TO HIGH	MEDIUM	MEDIUM TO LOW	VERY LOW
MODULUS	LOW	HIGH	MEDIUM TO LOW	LOW	VERY LOW
CTE	LOW	HIGH	VERY HIGH	VERY HIGH	VERY HIGH
ELECTRICAL LOSS	LOW	LOW TO HIGH	MEDIUM TO HIGH	MEDIUM TO HIGH	HIGH
ADHESION	HIGH	HIGH	MEDIUM TO HIGH	MEDIUM TO HIGH	LOW
THERMAL CONDUCTIVITY	HIGH	LOW TO HIGH*	LOW TO HIGH*	LOW TO MODERATE*	LOW TO MODERATE*

\*HEAT TRANSFER CAPABILITY IS A FUNCTION OF FILLER EMPLOYED

Table 3

MATERIAL	FUNCTION AT HIGH ELECTRIC STRESS	HIGH HEAT TRANSFER	LOW ELECTRICAL LOSSES	ADHERENT	PROCESSIBLE	REPAIRABLE	MECHANICAL ADEQUACY
EPON 825/HV	x		x	x	x		x
SCOTCHCAST 280			x	x	x		x
SCOTCHCAST 281		x	x	x	x		x
SCOTCHCAST		x	x	x	x		x
MR283 F-025				x	x		x
SCOTCHCAST		x		x	x		x
MR283 F-100				x	x		x
URALANE 5753				x	x	x	x
STYCAST 2651		x		x	x		x
STYCAST 2850FT		x	x	x	x		x
RICOTUFF LV (P)*	x		x	x	x		x
RICOTUFF LV (U)*	x		x	x	x		x
PR 1665				x	x	x	x
DA3C	x		x	x	x		x
HRG-3/A2			x	x	x	x	x
HRG-3/A0			x	x	x	x	x
CYCLOALIPHATIC EPOXY	x		x	x	x		x
CY225	x		x	x	x		x

\*P— POSTCURED

U — NOT POSTCURED

## 2.3 Standard Test Methods

Table 4 provides references for the configuration and test methodologies used in measuring material characteristics. Improvisation may be necessary in some cases - particularly associated with Silicones - to obtain more meaningful comparisons of materials. For example, temperature cycling is generally an excellent indicator of long term reliability. A test program to perform specific tests during (or after) a temperature cycle program could enhance material comparisons.

Table 4

TEST	DATA	SPECIFICATION	SPECIMEN CONFIGURATION	TEST CONDITIONS
ADHESIVE STRENGTH TO AL EPOXY AND/OR POLYIMIDE GLASS LAMINATE, FUSED Sn/Pb SOLDER	LAP-SHEAR STRENGTHS	ASTM D1002	1 IN. x 1/2 IN. x 0.005 IN. OVERLAP	ROOM TEMPERATURE 0.050 IN./MIN.
T-PEEL	PEEL	ASTM D1876	1 IN. W x 12 IN. L	ROOM TEMPERATURE 0.050 IN./MIN.
HARDNESS	SHORE VALUE (INITIAL AND 10 SEC DWELL)	ASTM D2240	HOCKEY PUCK	ROOM TEMPERATURE
SPECIFIC GRAVITY	SPECIFIC GRAVITY VALUE	ASTM D792	ANY	ROOM TEMPERATURE
MOISTURE EFFECT	EXPOSURE AND RECOVERY	MIL-STD 202 METHOD 105		-
DIELECTRIC STRENGTH	DIELECTRIC STRENGTH	ASTM D149	2 IN. D	ROOM TEMPERATURE, ~500V/SEC
VISCOSITY	VISCOSITY	ASTM D2393	±500 ML	ROOM TEMPERATURE AND 160°F
IZOD IMPACT	IZOD IMPACT	ASTM D256	1/2 x 1/2 x 2 1/2 IN.	ROOM TEMPERATURE
SHEAR STRENGTH	SHEAR VALUES			
DENSITY	DENSITY VALUES	ASTM D792 D1875		
THERMAL CONDUCTIVITY	CONDUCTIVITY VALUES	ASTM F433	2 IN. DIAMETER x 1/4 IN. THICK (2 IN. D x 1/4 IN. T)	-
THERMAL COEFFICIENT OF EXPANSION	CTE	HAC (TMA) OR ASTM E83 (DILATOMETER)	1/2 IN. D x 1/4 IN. T	-70 TO +200°C
ENTHALPY	ΔH	HAC (DSC)	1/2 IN. D x 1/4 IN. T	-70 TO 200°C
GLASS TRANSITION TEMPERATURE	T <sub>g</sub>	HAC (TMA/DSC)	1/2 IN. D x 1/4 IN. T	-70 TO 200°C
VOLUME/SURFACE RESISTIVITIES	OHM-CM (IN); OHM/□ AS FUNCT T°C	ASTM D257	4 IN. D x 0.040 IN. T	ROOM TEMPERATURE 500 VOLTS
DIELECTRICAL CONSTANT	DIELECTRIC CONSTANT AS FUNCT T°C AND FREQ	ASTM D150 (NO CONDITIONING)	2 IN. D x 0.040 IN. T	ROOM TEMPERATURE 1 VOLT RMS 1 kHz - 1 MHz
DISSIPATION FACTOR	DISSIPATION FACTOR AS FUNCT T°C AND FREQ			
TENSILE STRENGTH AND ELONGATION	YIELD AND ULTIMATE STRENGTHS/ELONGATION	ASTM D638	3/4 IN. x 7 IN. x 1/4 IN. DOGBONE	ROOM TEMPERATURE 0.050 IN./MIN.
TENSILE MODULUS	TENSILE MODULI			
ELECTRIC FIELD STRENGTH	V <sub>BD</sub>			
CORONA CHARACTERIZATION	CIV; DEV DISCHARGE ENERGY			

### 3.0 Test Parameters Of Components

Manufacturing reliable HVPSs requires continuous on-going test programs (and/or burn-in/conditioning programs) of high voltage components.

The tables in this section list key parameter tests of discrete components used in high voltage power supplies. Descriptions and references are provided. Where test methods are not specified, users frequently develop their own procedures and/or modify existing Mil-Spec, ASTM procedures.

#### COMPONENT — XFMR, HV

TEST	DATA	METHOD	PURPOSE
CORONA CHAR	CIV, CEV AT 60 Hz, DC AND $F_o$ ; DISCHARGE ENERGY AT 60 Hz AND DC		ASSESS QUALITY OF HV ISOLATION SYSTEMS
TEMP RISE UNDER LOAD	$\Delta T^o(S)$ FOR WINDINGS AND CORE AS FUNCT OF LOAD AND $F_{OP}$	MIL-T-27	ASSESS THERMAL DESIGN AND CONTROL TECHNIQUES
LIFE UNDER LOAD AT $F_{OP}$	$\Delta CIV$ , ETC AS FUNCT OF TIME; TIME TO FAILURE		DET PROBABLE OP LIFE TIMES VS RQMTS
THERMAL SHOCK RESISTANCE	$\Delta CIV$ , ETC AS FUNCT OF NO. CYCLES		DET EFFECTS OF THERMO-MECH STRESS ON HV ISOLATION QUALITY
MOISTURE	$\Delta CIV$ , ETC; $\Delta i$ LEAKAGE		GEN QUALITY HV INSULATION
ATTITUDE EFFECTS	$\Delta CIV$		INTEGRITY OF HV INSULATION
CONSTRUCTION REVIEW			CONSTRUCTION QUALITY TECHNIQUES

#### COMPONENT — XFMR, HV

TEST	DATA	METHOD	PURPOSE
<b>STANDARD XFMR TESTS</b>			
$L_{PRIM}$	SEE TEST		VERIFY DESIGN RQMTS
$I_{EXCIT}$	SEE TEST		VERIFY DESIGN RQMTS
$L_{LEAKAGE}$	SEE TEST		VERIFY DESIGN RQMTS
V/TURN RATIO	SEE TEST		VERIFY DESIGN RQMTS
$R_{DC}$	SEE TEST		VERIFY DESIGN RQMTS
$C_{DISTRIB}$	SEE TEST		VERIFY DESIGN RQMTS
INSUL RESIST	SEE TEST		VERIFY DESIGN RQMTS
DWV	SEE TEST	MIL-T-27	VERIFY DESIGN RQMTS
SHIELDING RATIO	SEE TEST	MIL-T-27	VERIFY DESIGN RQMTS
RESONANCE OPEN CKT SHORTED SEC	SEE TEST		VERIFY DESIGN RQMTS
MECHANICAL STRESS — SHOCK — VIBRATION	$\Delta CIV$ , ETC; $\Delta$ PARAMETRICS	MIL-STD-202	ASSESS MECH INTEGRITY OF DESIGN

## COMPONENT — ARIVIM, HV

TEST	DATA	METHOD	PURPOSE
V INDUCED	ΔCIV, ETC; EVIDENCE OF ELECTRICAL BRKDN	MIL-T-27	DESIGN MARGIN OF HV ISOLATION
IMMERSION (H <sub>2</sub> O)	ΔCIV, ETC; ΔI LEAKAGE	MIL-STD-202	QUALITY ELECTRICAL INSULATION

## COMPONENT — HV RECTIFIER DIODES

TEST	DATA	METHOD	PURPOSE
CORONA CHAR	CIV, CEV DC V <sub>R</sub>		CORONA EXISTENCE AFFECTING PERFORM/LIFE
SWITCHING TIMES	TURN-OFF/ON TIMES	MIL-STD-750C	DATA TO ESTIMATE OP FREQ LIMITS; INFO FORMATTING
POWER DISSIP AS FUNCT FREQ AND DUTY CYCLE	ΔT°, ΔV AS FUNCT F <sub>O</sub> AND DUTY CYCLE		ESTABL FREQ/DUTY CYCLE LIMITS
DET HEAT TRANSFER MECHANISMS	ΔT° BODY AND LEADS VARIOUS OP CONDITIONS		AID IN DESIGN/MATLS FOR THERMAL CONTROL
MATCHING CHAR — TURN-OFF — I <sub>R</sub> AT V <sub>R</sub> OP — V <sub>F</sub> AT I <sub>F</sub> OP	TURN-OFF TIME; I <sub>R</sub> ; V <sub>F</sub>		IDENT SIGNIF. PARAMETERS WHEN DEVICES USED IN SERIES
V <sub>F</sub> AS FCN I <sub>F</sub> AND T°C	SEE TEST		PREDICT OPERATE LOSSES
I <sub>R</sub> AS FCN V <sub>R</sub> AND T°C	SEE TEST		ASSESS V <sub>R</sub> DISTRIB IN SERIES CONFIG
V <sub>BD</sub>	SEE TEST	MIL-STD-750C	IDENT OP LIMITS V <sub>R</sub>
THERMAL SHOCK EFFECTS	ΔV <sub>F</sub> ; ΔI <sub>R</sub> ; ΔCIV DC		STRUCTURAL INTEGRITY
CONSTRUCTION REVIEW			CONSTRUCTION QUALITY, DEVICE DESIGN
FAILURE ANALYSES			SITE LOCATION; POSS. MECHANISMS
LEAD PULL STRENGTH	ΔV <sub>F</sub> AFT PRE LOAD; LOAD TO FAILURE	MIL-STD-750C	MECHANICAL INTEGRITY
HTRB	ΔI <sub>R</sub> ; ΔV <sub>F</sub> ; FAILURE RATES	MIL-STD-750C	DEVICE QUALITY

## COMPONENT — CAPACITORS, HV

TEST	DATA	METHOD	PURPOSE
CORONA CHAR	CIV, CEV AT 60 Hz, DC AND FOP DISCHARGE ENERGY AT 60 Hz AND DC		ASSESS GEN HV QUALITY AND PROBABLE LIFE TIME
DC LIFE — X V (X ≥ 1)	ΔCIV, ETC, ΔI LEAKAGE DC AS FCN TIME; TIME-TO-FAILURES		SEE ABOVE
INSULATION QUALITY	I LEAKAGE AS FUNCT V <sub>DC</sub> AND T°C		SEE ABOVE
THERMAL SHOCK EFFECTS — 25 CYCLE — EXTENDED CYCLE	ΔCIV, ETC; ΔI LEAKAGE AT V <sub>DC</sub> ; ΔC; ΔDF		EFFECTS OF THERMO MECH STRESS ON HV ISOLATION QUALITIES; DEVICE INTEGRITY
ATTITUDE EFFECTS	ΔCIV, ETC		QUALITY OF CONSTRUCTION
MOISTURE EFFECTS	ΔCIV, ETC; ΔI LEAKAGE		QUALITY INSULATION SYSTEM
CONSTRUCTION REVIEW			DESIGN METHODS; CONSTRUCTION QUALITY
FAILURE ANALYSES			IDENT FAILURE SITES:

# COMPONENT — CAPACITORS, HV

TEST	DATA	METHOD	PURPOSE
<b>STANDARD TESTS</b>			
— C, DF AS FNC FRQ AND T°C	SEE TEST	MIL-STD-202	DESIGN/FUNCTION VERIFICATION
— DWV	SEE TEST	MIL-STD-202	DESIGN/FUNCTION VERIFICATION
— VCC	SEE TEST	MIL-STD-202	DESIGN/FUNCTION VERIFICATION
— TCC	SEE TEST	MIL-STD-202	DESIGN/FUNCTION VERIFICATION
— V <sub>BD</sub>	SEE TEST	MIL-STD-202	DESIGN/FUNCTION VERIFICATION
— IMMERSION (H <sub>2</sub> O)	ΔI LEAKAGE AT V <sub>DC</sub>	MIL-STD-202	DESIGN/FUNCTION INTEGRITY

# COMPONENT — RESISTORS, HV

TEST	DATA	METHOD	PURPOSE
CORONA CHAR FOR R ≥ 100M OHMS DC	CIV, CEV AND DISCHARGE ENERGIES		PRODUCT QUALITY; SUSEPT TO CORONA DEGRAD
V <sub>BD</sub> — END-TO-END DC	V <sub>BD</sub>		ESTAB USE LIMITS
STABILITY AT V <sub>RATED</sub>	ΔR AS FUNCT TIME		DEVICE STABILITY
LIFE AT X V <sub>RATED</sub> (X ≥ 1)	ΔR AS FUNCT TIME	MIL-STD-202	ESTIMATING LIFE TIME AND STABILITY
THERMAL SHOCK EFFECTS	ΔR AS FUNCT NO. CYCLES		ASSESS THERMO- MECHANICAL INTEGRITY
MOISTURE EFFECTS	ΔR		ASSESS MOISTURE SUSEPT
VCR	SEE TEST		PERFORMANCE/APPLICATIONS
TCR	SEE TEST	MIL-STD-883	INDICATORS
R <sub>RATED</sub> VS TOL	SEE TEST		PRODUCT QUALITY
LEAD STRENGTH	ΔR DUE TO PRE LOADING; LOAD TO FAILURE		PRODUCT QUALITY; MECHANICAL INTEGRITY
CONSTRUCTION REVIEW			DESIGN DETAILS; CONSTRUCTION QUALITY
FAILURE ANALYSES			FAILURE SITES; POSS MECHANISMS

# COMPONENT — CONNECTOR, HV

TEST	DATA	METHOD	PURPOSE
CORONA CHAR — GND PLANE/SHELL — PIN-TO-PIN	CIV, CEV AT 60 Hz, DC AND FOP; DISCHARGE ENERGY AT 60 Hz AND DC		ASSESS GEN HV QUALITY DESIGN/MATERIALS
VOLTAGE WITHSTAND — GND PLANE/SHELL — PIN-TO-PIN DC	X, V <sub>RATED</sub> (X ≥ 1 ≤ 2); ΔCIV, ETC; ΔI LEAKAGE		SEE ABOVE
ALTITUDE EFFECTS	ΔCIV, ETC AT ALTITUDE		DESIGN AND/OR SEAL EFFECTIVENESS
MOISTURE EFFECTS	ΔCIV, ETC; ΔI LEAKAGE		QUALITY HV MATERIALS
MECHANICAL CHAR — IMPACT RESIST — CRUSH STRENGTH	FORCES/LOADS TO DAMAGE		MECH ADEQUACY
LIFE AT X, V <sub>RATED</sub> MULTIPIN ONLY (X ≥ 1)	SEE VOLTAGE		
R MATING	R VALUES FOR MATED PINS	4-TERMINAL	PRODUCT QUALITY
CONSTRUCTION REVIEW			DESIGN DETAILS; MAT'L'S; CONSTRUCTION QUALITY
FAILURE ANALYSES			FAILURE SITES; POSS MECHANISMS

## COMPONENT — CONNECTOR, HV

TEST	DATA	METHOD	PURPOSE
THERMAL SHOCK EFFECTS — SHELL AND MULTIPIN ONLY	ΔCIV, ETC; ΔR MATING		THERMOMECH STRESS RESPONSE TO HV ISOLATION INTEGRITY AND CONTACT MATING QUALITY

## COMPONENT — SPARK GAP, HV

TEST	DATA	METHOD	PURPOSE
CORONA CHAR	CIV, CEV, DISCHARGE ENERGY DC		ESTABL Δ BETWEEN CIV AND TRIGGER V <sub>DC</sub> ; AFFECTS ON V <sub>OP</sub>
TRIGGER VOLTAGE	V <sub>DC</sub> AT TRIGGER (VBD)		PRODUCT QUALITY/ UNIFORMITY
DISCHARGE EFFECTS	ΔCIV; ΔV <sub>BD</sub> AS FUNCT OF NO. OPERATIONS/TOT DISCHARGE ENERGY		EFFECTS OF OPERATIONS ON V <sub>BD</sub>
LEAD PULL	ΔCIV; V <sub>BD</sub> AFT PRELOAD; LOAD TO FAILURE		MECHANICAL INTEGRITY
LEAK TEST	SEE ABOVE		SEE ABOVE
CONSTRUCTION REVIEW			DESIGN DETAILS/MAT'L'S; CONSTRUCTION QUALITY

## COMPONENT — CABLES, HV

TEST	DATA	METHOD	PURPOSE
CORONA CHAR — TO GND PLANE	CIV, DEV, DISCHARGE ENERGY AT 60 Hz AND DC		ESTABL GEN QUALITY HV INSULATION
V <sub>BD</sub> TO GND PLANE RT ELEV TEMP	V <sub>BD</sub> DC THRU INSULATION		ESTABL V <sub>OP</sub> MAX AND AS AFFECTED BY TEMP
LIFE X, V RATED TO GND PLANE (X ≥ 1)	ΔCIV AS FUNCT OF TIME; TIME TO FAILURE		ESTABL V <sub>OP</sub> LIMITS
MOISTURE EFFECTS	ΔCIV ETD; ΔI LEAKAGE		MOISTURE SUSCEPT; GEN QUALITY
ALTITUDE EFFECTS	ΔCIV AT ALTITUDE		GEN QUALITY; SUSCEPT TO LOW PRESSURES
INSULATION QUALITY	I LEAKAGE FCN V <sub>DC</sub> AND T°C		QUALITY INDICATOR
MECHANICAL CHAR — TENSILE STRENGTH — CUT-THRU RESIST	SEE TEST		ASSESS MECHANICAL QUALITIES
CONSTRUCTION REVIEW			IDENT DESIGN/MAT'L DETAILS

#### 4.0 Environmental Stress Testing

The significance of environmental stress testing cannot be overstated for airborne applications. As a screening technique for verification of manufacturing reliability, as a comparative tool to assess the efficacy of design changes or as a measure of long term performance, this type of testing will serve as an extremely useful diagnostic tool.

In the course of the HVPS MANTECH program, reliable performance was verified with approximately 75 cycles (30 days of continuous exposure) applied to various encapsulated assemblies. As a screening for infant failures, all hardware produced for the ALQ-135 Countermeasures System undergoes four cycles of testing:

The Dynamic Environmental Stress Screening procedure consists of four (4) thermal cycles. Refer to Figure 1 for temperature profile. The HV is enabled after 5 minutes into the COLD to HOT transition and stays on the duration of HOT soak. Loading, based on typical TWT information, is applied whenever HV is enabled. If at any time there is a HV fault, the HV Assy will be disabled for the remaining duration of that cycle. It then will try to be re-enabled the next cycle. The fault detection will simulate the same fault control as in the LRU (3X fault). Total time for 1 cycle is 480 minutes.

The liquid cooled Cold plate temperature is kept at +35° C whenever High Voltage and loads are applied.

##### Setup

Loads(based on typical TWT information):

Bcath	10ma	
Bcoll	70ma	
Bcol2	150ma	
Acath	200mapk	5%D.C 2khz rate
Acol	1.26Apk	5%D.C 2khz rate

Coolant control: Adequate to maintain the cold plate temperature at +35°C/± 5°C.

Temperature:

Cold -55°C +/- 5°C

Hot +71°C +/- 5°C

Transition time 3 to 5°C/min

Test

Apply thin layer of thermal grease to bottom of HV Assy.

Ensure complete surface is covered.

Mount HV Assy to base-plate in chamber using torque tool.

Torque middle two (2) jackscrews first using 15 in/lbs, then torque remaining four (4) jackscrews using 8 in/lbs.

Mate all necessary connectors (HV, INV drive, feedback control) to the HV assy.

Verify operation of HV Assemble by enabling it for five (5) minutes at ambient (25°C) temperature utilizing loads as described in setup.

Proceed to run 4 cycles of ESS. Refer to Figure 1.

RECORD signature/employee # and date on MOT under Dynamic Environmental Stress Screening operation indicating 4 cycles of dynamic ESS had been completed.




FIGURE 1  
TEMPERATURE PROFILE

STEP	SET PT (°C)	TIME	NEXT STEP	REPEAT
1	23	00:01	2	0
2	25	00:01	3	0
3	25	30:00	4	0
4	-35	00:01	5	0
5	-35	1:00:00	6	0
6	-45	00:01	7	0
7	-45	30:00	8	0
8	-50	00:01	9	0
9	-50	1:00:00	10	0
10	-55	00:01	11	0
11	-55	2:00:00	12	0
12	71	00:01	13	0
13	71	1:40:00	14	0
14	23	00:01	1	3
*15	23	1:00:00	16	0
16	23	8:00:00	17	0
17	23	1:00:00	00	0

TABLE 1  
CHAMBER PROGRAMMING  
(TENNEY ASSET #67752)

\* NOTE: UNIT MAY BE REMOVED HERE

## 5.0 Cost-Benefits and Design Of Experiments (DOE)

### 5.1 Introduction

In a manufacturing environment it is essential that the benefits associated with the costs to determine material properties, component performance, operating lifetimes of equipment, etc. be established prior to the start of a test program. This analysis essentially involves determining the sample size and test duration required to establish attributes with a preselected confidence level. It is essential also that the results of any experimental test program be validated and reproducible by other suppliers, contractors or interested organizations. Conclusions must be sound in accordance with proven statistical techniques.

To determine such things as sample size when there is no existing reliable data, several assumptions must be made. Factors such as type of data distribution and repeatability of a test method (including the equipment and operator) must be estimated in order to develop a reasonable plan. Such things as accuracy of test results can be assured by verifying the results from a primary test site at a secondary test site. If there is significant disagreement between the two, a third or referee test site may be needed. It should be assumed that material and component properties or some transformation of them (i.e. log or inverse) are distributed normally. However lifetime data (MTBF) is assumed to be distributed exponentially. These initial assumptions must then be verified and modified as necessary as the first test results are evaluated.

### 5.2 Material testing

For initial test runs assume that the test method is repeatable within +/- 10 percent of the true mean ( $\mu$ ) value and that if the appropriate number of samples are tested, the average value ( $\bar{x}$ -bar) will be within +/- 2 percent of the true mean.

To determine the appropriate sample size, the following standard can be used:

$$n = [(z * \sigma)/a]^2 \quad (\text{equation 1})$$

where      n= number of samples  
z= critical value from the Standard Normal Distribution corresponding to the chosen confidence interval  
a= margin of error for  $\mu$  the true mean for an infinite sample size  
 $\sigma$ = sigma, the true standard deviation for the population from which the samples are drawn

Since sigma is the standard deviation of an infinite population and therefore unknown, it must be estimated by using the fact that in a normal distribution; 68 percent of the population will fall within  $+/- 1\sigma$ , 95 percent of the population will fall into  $+/- 2\sigma$ , and 99.7 percent fall into the  $+/- 3\sigma$  range.

Taking a conservative approach, a is estimated as the total range of test values (R) divided by 4. The range is divided by 4 rather than 6 since there is so little gain in probability between  $+/- 2\sigma$  and  $+/- 3\sigma$ . Dividing by 6 then, might define an insufficient sample size. Especially for the initial attempts, it is better to err on the side of caution. Thus equation 1 becomes:

$$n = [(R * z)/(4 * a)]^2 \quad (\text{equation 2})$$

At this point testing costs should be estimated and compared with the benefits to be achieved by the program. If the sample size n is prohibitively large, a different set of parameters may need to be established. For values of n at other conditions, see Tables 8-1 and 8-2.

Once the initial testing is complete it will be necessary to reevaluate any preliminary assumptions. If the sample range is greater than 20% of the sample average, it would be desirable to examine the test method, equipment, technique, etc., to determine if there are any attributable causes for the sample variation. If any cause of variance can be identified, it should be corrected and another set of samples run. If attributable cause cannot be found, then the initial assumption, that the range is within + 10% of the mean, must be rejected. If any known attributable cause is not eliminated, then the set will not be random and cannot be used to approximate a normal distribution. If the testing shows a lesser variation than assumed, the number of samples necessary can

be reduced or a higher confidence level assigned. 42 Once the testing is complete for any given parameter, the sample average ( $\bar{x}$ ) and sample deviation ( $S$ ) will be calculated. These results are a measure of the precision of the test method and are denoted as "within" calculations. For further sample size calculations the sample deviation ( $S$ ) should be substituted for the standard deviation ( $\sigma$ ) in equations 1 and 2.

### 5.3 Component Testing

As stated earlier, component parameter testing should be conducted based on a normal statistical distribution, thus sample size estimates etc. are calculated as stated above for material properties.

One of the most significant attributes of any component or system is its working life or Mean Time Between Failure (MTBF). Since this life data is usually not normal in distribution, the assumptions and equations used above are no longer applicable. Instead life test data of high voltage equipment should be assumed to follow a Weibull distribution. For the initial estimations, however, the data is assumed to follow an exponential distribution (a Weibull distribution having shape parameter  $\beta=1$ ) to simplify some of the calculations.

To estimate the number of samples required for life testing, the equation is:

$$r = n * p \quad (\text{equation 3})$$

where  $r$  = the number of failures

$n$  = the number of samples

$p$  = the proportion of failure =  $1 - e^{(-\lambda T)}$

$T$  = the time of test termination

$\lambda$  =  $(\text{MTBF})^{-1}$

Since, again, none of these parameters are known, it is essential to assume preliminary values. To achieve a reasonable confidence in the estimated MTBF, it is necessary to observe a high number of failures. To accomplish this, either a large number of samples must be tested or the failure proportion term must be made large by making  $T$  larger. If the test items are expensive and/or difficult to obtain, increasing  $T$  is the more practical method. Equation 3 should be used to estimate cost tradeoffs of  $n$  and  $T$  for an estimated or required MTBF.

TABLE 8-1 SAMPLE SIZE AT VARIOUS RANGE AND ERROR VALUES

z= 1.65 (90% confidence)

Range as a percent of  $\mu$ 

$a \text{ as } \% \mu$	$\backslash R$	5%	10%	20%	25%	50%	100%
1%	4.3	17.0	68.1	106.3	425.4	1701.6	
2%	1.1	4.3	17.0	26.6	106.3	425.4	
3%	0.5	1.9	7.6	11.8	47.3	189.1	
4%	0.3	1.1	4.3	6.6	26.6	106.3	
5%	0.2	0.7	2.7	4.3	17.0	68.1	
6%	0.1	0.5	1.9	3.0	11.8	47.3	
7%	0.1	0.3	1.4	2.2	8.7	34.7	
8%	0.1	0.3	1.1	1.7	6.6	26.6	
9%	0.1	0.2	0.8	1.3	5.3	21.0	
10%	0.0	0.2	0.7	1.1	4.3	17.0	
11%	0.0	0.1	0.6	0.9	3.5	14.1	
12%	0.0	0.1	0.5	0.7	3.0	11.8	
13%	0.0	0.1	0.4	0.6	2.5	10.1	
14%	0.0	0.1	0.3	0.5	2.2	8.7	
15%	0.0	0.1	0.3	0.5	1.9	7.6	
20%	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.3	1.1	4.3	
25%	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.7	2.7	

TABLE 8-2 SAMPLE SIZE AT VARIOUS RANGE AND ERROR VALUES

z= 1.96 (95% confidence)

Range as a percent of u

$\alpha$ as % u	\R a\	5%	10%	20%	25%	50%	100%
1%	6.0	24.0	96.0	150.1	600.3	2401.0	
2%	1.5	6.0	24.0	37.5	150.1	600.3	
3%	0.7	2.7	10.7	16.7	66.7	266.8	
4%	0.4	1.5	6.0	9.4	37.5	150.1	
5%	0.2	1.0	3.8	6.0	24.0	96.0	
6%	0.2	0.7	2.7	4.2	16.7	66.7	
7%	0.1	0.5	2.0	3.1	12.2	49.0	
8%	0.1	0.4	1.5	2.3	9.4	37.5	
9%	0.1	0.3	1.2	1.9	7.4	29.6	
10%	0.1	0.2	1.0	1.5	6.0	24.0	
11%	0.0	0.2	0.8	1.2	5.0	19.8	
12%	0.0	0.2	0.7	1.0	4.2	16.7	
13%	0.0	0.1	0.6	0.9	3.6	14.2	
14%	0.0	0.1	0.5	0.8	3.1	12.2	
15%	0.0	0.1	0.4	0.7	2.7	10.7	
20%	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.4	1.5	6.0	
25%	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.2	1.0	3.8	

## 6.0 Database

At the beginning of the program, it was anticipated that a significant amount of detailed experimental data of various types would be collected. Consideration was given to providing this data in the form of a computerized database that would allow establishing a consistent body of data, thus providing direct comparisons between candidates and candidate approaches.

It was believed that, once the database had been established, it would be possible to allow off-site users to have access to the data, by distributing to them at regular intervals updates to the database in an easily readable format. Not anticipating the rapid growth of internet and other readily available schemes, we considered that distribution by floppy disk or compact disk would be ideal, in the event that some users might not be able to go on-line. However this data was distributed, it was hoped users would be able to search, sort, format, analyze, and display the data in any way that they wished.

It was also envisioned that the database administrator could solicit from other workers additional data that would extend or complement that already in the database, and then add this new data to the database and distribute the result. Such a database could be a living document that could serve as a continually updated resource for all HVPS manufacturers.

Therefore, a task was initiated to study the issues involved in databasing for HVPS design and manufacturing. The objective of this activity was to determine what sort of software would be needed to document, format, search, sort, analyze, and display the following types of data:

- Material properties
- Component properties
- Design data
- Packaging approaches
- MTS projects and results
- Test methods
- Processing parameters

The first step toward this goal was to determine whether or not any commercial database software was available that would provide the features that we thought were necessary. To do this, the following listing of general requirements was established to judge the database software:

- Data input allowed
- Editorial input allowed
- Customizable to program needs
- Easy editing

- Sorts and ranks
- Tabulated displays
- Graphical displays
- Can input data already in graphical or tabulated form
- Can take data from an existing format, mingle it, and redisplay only its independent variables
- Database supplier willing to maintain the new database
- Loadable into PC
- Can compare more than two items simultaneously (e.g. materials, components, and packaging)
- Test values referenced by method, with an area for description and comments
- Multiple user capability
- Reliable and stable database supplier
- Bulletin board access

Sorting and ranking are of course key capabilities of a databasing program, and we wanted to ensure that the software selected allowed the greatest possible flexibility in doing this. As an example, suppose that a set of materials were tested for a variety of physical, mechanical, electrical, and processing properties. Such properties might include:

- Dielectric strength
- Dielectric constant (1 kHz to 1 Mhz)
- Volume resistivity
- Dissipation factor (1 kHz to 1 Mhz)
- hardness
- Thermal conductivity
- Tensile strength
- Elongation
- Lap-shear
- T-peel
- Decomposition temperature
- Glass transition temperature
- Coefficient of thermal expansion
- Work life under normal processing conditions
- Viscosity
- Izod impact strength

A large number of materials might be tested for these properties, and the selected database would have to allow all of this data to be entered into it. The database should then be very flexible in allowing subsets of this data to be abstracted, processed, and displayed. For example, if dielectric constant was the property of interest, the database should allow only the dielectric constant value data for each candidate to be abstracted. Then, the database should allow data processing on that subset of the data. In our example, we might wish to categorize and list the materials in the database in the order of increasing dielectric constant.

Twelve data bases were evaluated against these criteria, and they are shown in the table below. Here, the column labelled "entries" indicates the number of entries that the program allowed for each database. The column labelled "update" indicates the number of times per year that the database program is updated by its supplier. The column labelled "format" shows how the software is supplied to the user. The column labelled "customizing" shows whether or not the supplier allows it to be customized in a flexible way to provide the various formats required for the HVPS application.

<u>Database</u>	<u>Entries</u>	<u>Update</u>	<u>Format</u>	<u>Customizing</u>
Cen Base	> 16,000	4x/yr	CD ROM	Yes
Int'l Plastics Sector	~ 12,700	4x/yr	Disk	No
Plaspec	~ 11,000	6x/yr	On line	No
Eng Design Database (GE)	~ 500		On line	No
Polyfacts (DuPont)	~ 200		on line	No
Eng Properties on Screen (EPOS)	~ 600		Disk	No
Campus (Mobay)	~ 150		Disk	No
Campus (BASF)	~ 150		Disk	No
Percept	~ 12,500	No	Disk	Yes (CAE)
Plastics Design Library	~ 50	No	Hard Copy	No
Fast Focus (Hoechst Celanese)	~ 200		Disk	No
Thermofile (Thermofil)	~ 450		Disk	No

Of all of these commercially available databases, only the Cen Base software offered the desired set of capabilities, including a large number of possible entries, regular software updates by the manufacturer who would agree to add our data to his database and distribute the updated database to the user community, software available on an easily mailed electronic format, and the ability to freely customize the database. Appendix 2-1 contains additional information about the Cen Base program.

While we were able to select the best database software from those available, it proved infeasible to actually implement this databasing concept. This was because uncertainties in future funding make it impossible to keep the database current, a failing that would render it obsolete and useless.

# Quality Function Deployment for High Voltage Power Supplies

Appendix 2-1

## THE EVALUATION FORMS AND THEIR USE IN THE QFD REVIEW

### 1.0 Introduction

The performing of a QFD Review as the first step in designing of a High Voltage Power Supply is intended to achieve a power supply whose manufacturability and associated quality is enhanced as a result of the QFD. In support of these goals, the QFD Review offers the following benefits -

- o means to assure that the requirements of the power supply are adequately defined.
- o assists in identifying and making choices at each level of the design and development process.
- o serves as a map showing -
  - relationships between the various elements of the power supply and their function
  - conditions where interactions between elements of the power supply and between these elements and their environments may affect behavior
  - potential problems within the design and its construction
  - benefits which can result when the choices and selections are linked via the QFD process
- o documented results function as a history of the design and development process.

In the following sections each of the forms comprising the QFD will be described and methods for their use presented.

### 2.0 Descriptions of the QFD Forms.

In this section each of the forms used in the QFD analysis are briefly described in terms of its function. For many of the forms the form title is self descriptive of its purpose.

The forms are divided into three (3) categories -

- 1 - Requirements vs. Methods of Achievement Forms
- 2 - Experiment and Analyses Forms
- 3 - Worksheets and Other Forms

Following are the descriptions of the 25 forms in the three (3) categories comprising the QFD.

## 2.1 Requirements vs. Method of Achievement Forms

### - Figure 1. - HVPS Requirement vs. Design. Basic Form.

This would typically be the first form used in the QFD analysis and is typical of the Requirements vs. Methods of Achievement (WHAT vs. HOW) forms. This form is used to evaluate and compare Candidate Designs in terms of their capabilities to meet the Requirements of the HVPS. This form is intended to be used for both conceptual design and detailed design candidate evaluations.

### Figure 2 - HVPS Requirements vs. Design. Extended Form Expanded Basic

This form is similar in format and purpose to Figure 1. It differs only in that it allows more specific requirements entries under each of the general requirements.

### Figure 3. - HVPS Requirements vs. Design. Extended Form, Detailed.

This form is similar in purpose to Figure 1. It differs in that specific requirements are identified for each of the general requirements.

### Figure 4. - HVPS Requirements vs. Design. Open Form.

With this form, the user provides all of the requirement listings.

### Figure 5. - Packaging Elements vs. Candidate Designs. Basic Form.

This form is intended to evaluate specific physical characteristics (Packaging Elements) of candidate designs in order to establish feasibilities of translating concepts and paper details into hardware.

Figure 6. - Packaging Elements vs. Candidate Designs. Open Form.

This form is similar in purpose to Figure 5. Here the user provides all of the packaging element details.

Figure 7. - Component Requirements vs. Candidates. Basic Form.

This is a basic form which can be used for the evaluation of all component types, including electrical and non-electrical items.

Using this form Candidate Components are evaluated and compared in terms of their capabilities to meet the specified Requirements.

Figure 8. - Component Requirements vs. Candidates. Extended Form, Expanded Basic.

This form is similar in format and purpose to Figure 7. It differs only in that it allows more specific requirements entries under each of the general requirements.

Figure 9. - Component Requirements vs. Candidates. Extended Form. Detailed, General

This form is similar in purpose to Figure 7. It differs in that specific requirements are identified for each of the general requirements. This form was not intended for non-electrical items

Figure 10. - Component Requirements vs. Candidates. Extended Form. Detailed, Capacitors.

This form is used to compare and evaluate Candidate Capacitors in terms of their capabilities to meet specified Requirements. The form is intended to be used in the evaluation of capacitors for all applications and functions.

Figure 11. - Component Requirements vs. Candidates. Extended Form. Detailed, Diodes

This form is used to compare and evaluate Candidate Diodes (and Other Semiconductor Devices) in terms of their capabilities to meet specific Requirements. The form is intended to be used in the evaluation of Diodes and other semiconductor devices for all applications and functions.

Figure 12. - Component Requirements vs. Candidates. Extended Form. Detailed, Magnetics

This form is intended to be used in the evaluation of all Magnetics components including inductors and transformers for all applications. The form is used to compare and evaluate Candidate Magnetic Devices in terms of specific Requirements.

Figure 13. - Component Requirements vs. Candidates. Extended Form. Detailed, Resistors

This form is intended to be used in the evaluation of all Resistor products for all applications. The form is for use in comparing and evaluating Candidate Resistors in terms of specific Requirements.

Figure 14. - Component Requirements vs. Candidates. Open Form.

This form is similar in purpose to Figure 7, usable for both electrical and non-electrical components. Here the user identifies all of the Requirements and the Candidate Components to be evaluated.

Figure 15. Materials Requirements vs. Candidates. Basic Form.

This is a basic form for use in the evaluations of all materials, of any type - gas, liquid and solid, and for any application - electrical, mechanical, thermal and environmental. With this form Candidate Materials are compared and evaluated in terms of specific Requirements.

Figure 16. Materials Requirements vs. Candidates. Extended Form, Gases.

This form is intended for the evaluation of Candidate Materials which will exist and operate as Gases within the HVPS.

Figure 17. Materials Requirements vs. Candidates. Extended Form, Liquids.

This form is intended for the evaluation of Candidate Materials which will exist and operate as Liquids within the HVPS.

Figure 18. - Materials Requirements vs. Candidates. Extended Form, Solids.

This form is intended for the evaluation of Candidate Materials which will exist and operate as Solids within the HVPS.

Figure 19. - Materials Requirements vs. Candidates. Open Form.

This form is similar in purpose to Figure 15. Here the user determines all of the REQUIREMENTS and the Candidate Materials to be evaluated..

Figure 20. - Open Form, General Use.

This is a Requirements vs. Methods form which the user can employ for any appropriate evaluation. Here the user defines all of the Requirements and the General Method of Achievement, i.e. the Candidates to be evaluated.

## 2.2 Experimental Analyses and Development Forms

These forms are intended to assist in identifying areas of engineering and experimental analyses and in determining specific requirements associated with these analyses.

Figure 21. - Interaction Identification Form.

This form is intended to identify potential areas where further engineering and experimental analyses may be required. The form is to be used during the Requirements-Methods of Achievements evaluations. During these evaluations when areas of unknown or question behavior of an item and/or its environment are noted they should be recorded on the Interaction form. A summary of the types of entries for this form are given in Section 3.2.

Figure 22. - Interaction Identification Form.

This is a format variation of Figure 21. and would be used in the same manner.

Figure 23. - Model Test Structure (MTS) Variables.

This form is intended to identify the engineering and experimental details, in the form of the variables, which would be evaluated when and if topics identified in Figures 21 and 22 are selected for further analyses. The results derived from these forms would serve as the guidelines for any analyses or experimental evaluations associated with the topic under consideration.

## 2.3 Worksheets and Other Forms

Figure 24. - Worksheet

This form is intended to aid in the evaluations of candidate components and materials. This is accomplished by relating specific requirements (of an item) to the corresponding properties of the candidates. With an assigned value for the requirement, the corresponding property value of the candidate can be compared and the candidates adequacy determined.

Figure 25. - Commentary.

This form is to be used to record any comments determined necessary to provide comprehension to the other portions of the QFD Review.

3.0 Use of the QFD Forms.

3.1 The Requirements vs. Methods Forms.

The following section will describe the general use of the WHAT - HOW (or Requirements vs. Methods of Achievement) forms. The usage will be primarily demonstrated using the HVPS Requirements vs. Design form.

A sample of this form, shown in Figure 1A, has been numerically identified to aid in understanding its use. In the following sections each of the numerically identified areas will be explained.

HVPS REQUIREMENTS vs.  
DESIGN  
Basic form

Figure 1A. Area 1. HVPS Requirement vs. Design. Basic Form.

The title is generally based on the items or areas of Requirements and the Methods of Achievement. In this example the Requirements are HVPS Requirements and the Methods of Achievements are Candidate Designs, hence the form title.

Note that many of the Requirements vs Methods forms exist in several versions. The variations in forms dealing with the same topic are described in Section 2.1

PROGRAM \_\_\_\_\_  
Item \_\_\_\_\_  
Prepared by \_\_\_\_\_  
Date(s) \_\_\_\_\_

Figure 1A. Area 2.

This section identifies the Program or project associated with the QFD. Item here refers to the specific, system, subsystem, article, etc. under evaluation.




Figure 1A. Areas 3, 4 and 5.

Area 3 refers to the general topical area of Requirements under evaluation. In this example High Voltage Power Supply (HVPS) Requirements.

Area 4 identifies and lists subtopical areas whose Requirements must be met to achieve overall all acceptability of the general item under evaluation.

Note that in the Basic Forms general topical areas or items are identified such as in the Example form, Electrical, Thermal, Mechanical, etc.

For the most basic evaluation the major items or property requirements within these "general", Electrical, Thermal etc., areas would be lumped and the resulting assessment based on the lumped or combined determination.

At the next level of refinement key properties would be identified within each general area and the resulting assessment then based on the specific values and/or general determinations for each specific property. In the Basic Forms, spaces are available for 3-4 key properties. For example:

Electrical  
    voltage, operate  
    power  
    efficiency

In the Extended versions of most forms, key properties are included. Those selected are ones most commonly encountered in High Voltage Power Supplies and their related requirements.

Two issues are of note for the Requirements sections of all forms. **First**, it's not necessary to define each general topic or listed property when performing evaluations. Use only those properties for which Requirements exist and/or those determined necessary to establish a satisfactory product. **Second**, each form whether Basic or Extended has areas for both general topic additions and for additions of other key properties within topical areas. These areas of the forms are identified in Figure 1A. as Areas 4 and 5 respectively. Make additions in each area as appropriate to the evaluation being conducted.

ENGINEERING REQUIREMENTS

Figure 1A. Area 6.

This row is available for listing specific Engineering Requirements. These could include specific values for key properties, acceptance/rejection levels, less than/greater than values, merit factors, etc.

The use of this row is considered optional. When used, again, it is not necessary that each topic or key property have an entry.

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.
DESIGN-									

Figure 1A., Areas 7 and 8.

This section of the form identifies the Methods of Achieving the requirements. Area 7. identifies the general area of achievement. In the example shown here it is high voltage power supply Designs. In the columns identified by Area 8. the specific candidates to be evaluated would be listed. Each of the Requirements vs. Methods of Achievement forms allows up to 12 candidates to be evaluated.




Figure 1A. Area 9.

RANKING SCALE \_\_\_\_\_  
WEIGHING FACTOR \_\_\_\_\_

Figure 1A. Area 10.

The column identified by Area 9 provides for the use and notation of Weighing Factors which may be used in performing the evaluations. Weighing Factors or Weights define a numerical scale of relative importance for the specific requirements. Such scales are arbitrary. The principal consideration in selecting the scale range is that it be such as to permit a clear differential in properties when such differences are required or desired. For example a weighing factor scale of 0 to 5 where the difference are expresses in unit (1) increments will not be as differentiating as one of 0 to 10 also using unit (1) increments of difference.

An example of the use of Weighing Factors is shown in Figure 26. Here the weighing factor scale is 0 to 1.0 with minimum increment of 0.1. In this example the larger values represent relatively more important requirements. Area 10 identifies the Weight Factor Scale values when used in the evaluations. Area Item 10. also identifies a Ranking scale.

This value is intended to compare the specific properties of the Candidates (Methods of Achievement) in terms of a particular requirement. Here again a scale would be used and its values noted under Ranking.

In the example shown in Figure 26, the Ranking scale is 0 to 10 in unit (1) increments with the larger values indicating the candidate having the preferred properties for a given requirement.

For the example shown in Figure 26 when the Weighing Factor is (W.F.) is multiplied by the Rank Value (R..V.) the product is defined as the Assessed Value (A.V.),

$$A.V. = W.F. \times R.V.$$

This Assessed Value provides one of the means of Candidate (Methods of Achievement) evaluations. The candidate having the larger Assessed Value for a Requirement is considered superior.




Figure 1A. Area 11

This is the Assessment portion of the form. In this area properties of the individual candidates are assessed in terms of the specific requirements they are intended to meet.

The use of this portion of the form is critical to the successful application of the QFD evaluation. It is in these Assessments that ultimately candidates are selected or discarded. It is also in these Assessments that candidates and variables are identified for the Interaction Studies. For

these reasons the Assessment phase of the QFD should be performed with appropriate rigor.

The following section present examples of methods which can be used in the Assessment process.

One method of assessment employs +, - and 0. In this method if a candidate property satisfies a requirement the assessment is given a +; if it fails to meet or satisfy the requirement the assessment is a -. Where the candidate property is neutral, not impacting or is the baseline a 0 is the assessment value. An example of the use of this method of assessment is shown in Figure 27.

It should be noted that when the +, -, 0 method is used, it may be weighted based on the relative importance of the requirements. For example a Weighting Factor Scale of 0 to 10 in unit (1) increments might be employed. If a Requirement has a Weighing Factor of eight (8) and a Candidate's property associated with that requirement is determined to meet that requirement, then that candidate be assigned 8+'s for that requirement. This method of evaluation is shown in Figure 28.

In another Assessment method Rank Values are used to compare the specific properties of the candidates to specific requirements. In the example shown in Figure 29 the Ranking Scale is 0 to 10 in unit (1) increments. A large Rank value means a particular candidate property more closely satisfies a requirement . A value of 10 means it completely meets that requirement.

In the last Assessment method discussed here Rank Values are combined with Weighing Factors to arrive at Assessed Values. In the example shown in Figure 26 and described previously the larger Assessed Values define a higher degree of both a particular requirement and overall product requirement satisfaction.

In using each of these or other Assessment methods, the goal should be to employ as much objectivity and factual inputs as can reasonably be done. This is to assure the maximum objectiveness in the final candidate selections.

E							
~							
O							
I							
+							
-							

\* DOES NOT MEET CRITICAL/MINIMUM CRITERIA

Figure 1A.. Area 12.




Figure 1A. Area 13.

These areas are the Evaluation sections in which the Assessment Summaries are presented. These summaries are described in two forms.

Item Area 12. presents the summary assessments for the candidates under review. In this summary either a numerical assessment is given, or a summarizing of the +'s, -'s and 0's is made. The candidate are then judged on the numerical comparisons or on the summaries of the +'s, -'s and 0's.

The Evaluation section described by Area 13. has been included to identify Requirements relationships to ALL candidates. Use of these Evaluators can identify both major and non problem areas common to all candidates. When either condition exists such information is useful in planning subsequent engineering evaluations following the QFD.

COMMENTS

Figure 1A. Area 14.

Each of the Requirements - Methods of Achievement Forms contains a COMMENTS Column. This column is intended to contain any remarks, notes, considerations, etc. which are relevant to the evaluation.

As required the supplement Comments sheet, Figure 25, may be included as part of each evaluation form..

The procedures described previously have used the HVPS Requirement vs Design form to present the procedure for using the Requirements vs. Methods of Achievement form. This procedure would be the one followed for all forms of this type.

### **3.2 INTERACTION IDENTIFICATION FORM**

Two versions of this form are available for use. Both serve the same function, and the selection of either is a matter of personal choice. The two forms are shown in Figures 21 and 22.

As the form title states these forms are intended to identify areas of possible Interactions whose resultant effects could alter the predicted performance of the component, material, subassembly, etc. from values derived from individual property evaluations.

The results derived from using these forms should aid in establishing the basic areas for subsequent engineering studies and evaluations in both -

- o arriving at final candidate selections
- o resolving and demonstrating design and selection details for the final HVPS configuration and construction.

As with all of the forms in this format the use of the Interaction Forms will and should be determined by individual needs and experience. The following are suggestions for their use.

As the Requirements vs. Methods of Achievement proceed - from the HVPS Requirements through Components and Materials evaluation, list the following types of items in the Interaction Identification form -

- o items where information regarding properties, performance, failure conditions, etc. is lacking either generally (all similar applications) or specifically (for the intended application).
- o items where information needs updating due to other factors such as process variations, new materials, design variations, different operating conditions, etc.
- o new applications of "old" technologies
- o new technologies
- o "blue sky" issues

The items to be included in the Interaction Form need not be highly detailed as the details for each item or area will be developed in the next phase of this evaluation, the Model Test Structures Variables Summary.

When the listing in the Interaction form is completed, one goes through the form and checks or fills in the row-column boxes where interactions are known or expected. An example of this identification process is shown in Figure 30. The identifications along with all of the items presented in the Interaction form provide the basis for the next step in the process, the use of the Model Test Structures Variables form.

### 3.3 MODEL TEST STRUCTURES (MTS)

#### Variable Summary

This form, shown in Figure 23, is intended to identify the variables to be evaluated using the Model Test Structure (MTS) approach. MTS's are physical test models which are so designed and constructed as to represent a set of conditions - design, components, materials, etc. - whose interactive behavior is to be evaluated. The focus in developing the MTS should be on the accuracy of the structure in terms of its replicating the conditions of interest, and on simplicity. The MTS should only reflect the variables and features of interest and need not be a complete HVPS or necessarily a complete subsystem.

The evaluation results from these MTS studies are intended to serve as the primary guide in

- 1- candidate evaluations and selections.
- 2- final HVPS configuration and construction.

The first step in the use of the MTS variables forms is the determination of which of the items listed in the Interaction Form are to be considered for further evaluations. This review should include a review of both the listed items and the listed items and their possible interactions.

Once the selections have been made the MTS Variables form comes into play.

First the item or topic of the MTS is identified. This is recorded in the section described by Figure 23A., Area 1.

MTS \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Figure 23A Area 1.

VARIABLES

---

---

---

---

---

Figure 23A. Area 2

Next, all of the identifiable variables associated with the MTS evaluations are listed. These should include both hardware issues and operating factors. This list is compiled in Area 2 of Figure 23A.

Having established the variables list, this list is then reviewed for the variables to be incorporated into the MTS for evaluation and analyses. This selection process maybe required in order to conduct a manageable experiment in which several variables are varied in order to assess their role in the behavior of the system under evaluation.

An alternate approach to the variable variations is to incorporate all of the significant variables into a single MTS and observe its performance. In either approach the variables to be evaluated should be identified and noted in Area 3 of Figure 23A.

TO BE EVALUATED

---

---

---

---

---

Figure 23A, Area 3.

Finally, Area 4 of Figure 23A is used for any COMMENTS associated with the use of this form.

COMMENTS

Figure 23A, Area 4.

An example of the use of the MTS Variables form is given in Figure 31.

The results of the review using this form are intended to guide the physical design of the Model Test Structures and to establish the conditions for its evaluation including the response parameters to be monitored.

### 3.4 WORKSHEET

This form, shown in Figure 24, is intended primarily as an aid in the evaluation of components and materials.

This is done by identifying particular Item/Product Requirements for the Candidate Component or Material being evaluated. These requirements are entered in the Item/Product Requirement column of the worksheet (see Figure 24A, Area 1.).

ITEMS/PRODUCT REQUIREMENT

Figure 24A, Area 1.

Next the CANDIDATE PROPERTY governing that requirement is identified and listed in Area 2 of Figure 24A.

CANDID. PROPERTY

Figure 24A, Area 2.

Then the Required value of this Property is entered in Area 3. of Figure 24A. This is typically a numerical value but may also be greater than/less than values, or PASS/FAIL CRITERIA.

PROPERTY REQUIREMENT

Figure 24A, Area 3.

Next the prospective CANDIDATES are listed in Area 4 of Figure 24A.

CANDIDATES				

Figure 24A,Area 4.

The property values of the candidates corresponding to the CANDIDATE PROPERTY are then recorded in Area 5 of Figure 24A.

CANDIDATES				
5.				
	16			

Figure 24A Areas 5 and 6.

Finally, the specific property of each CANDIDATE is judged in terms of its meeting the corresponding Property REQUIREMENT. Those properties of candidates meeting or exceeding the requirements are given a + in Area 6 of Figure 24A; those not meeting the requirement are given a -; a marginal value is assigned an 0; and if no data is available a ? is recorded.

The last operation is to summarize and record the results in Area 7. of Figure 24A.

-	-					
O						
I						
+						
*						

\* DOES NOT MEET CRITICAL/MINIMUM CRITERIA

Form HVO-BVS Rev. 3C

Figure 24A, Area 7.

Final candidate selections are supported by the results developed by this form. It may also be used in identifying areas where CANDIDATE PROPERTY characterization tests may be required before the selection process can be completed.

An example showing the use of the Worksheet is given in Figure 32.

### 3.5 COMMENTS

As noted by the title, this form, shown in Figure 25, is intended to be used for any and all commentary associated the evaluations of the QFD. Commentary is considered an important part of these evaluations in that it may provide bridges, rationales and insights into the various aspects of the evaluations.

The use of the COMMENTS sections of each of the forms along with the COMMENTS sheet is intended to assist in achieving a comprehensive and critical evaluation leading to a more effective selection of the choices to be made in developing the High Voltage Power Supply.

PROGRAM \_\_\_\_\_  
 Item \_\_\_\_\_  
 Prepared by \_\_\_\_\_  
 Date(s) \_\_\_\_\_

PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS	ENGINEERING REQUIREMENTS	WEIGHING FACTORS	DESIGN-								COMMENTS
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
ELECTRICAL										+ - O ?	
THERMAL											
MECHANICAL											
PHYSICAL											
ENVIRONMENTAL											
RELIABILITY											
Maintainability											
TESTS											
COST											
SCHEDULE											
APPLICATION											
SAFETY											
TECHNICAL RISK											
SPECIFICATIONS											
CUSTOMER DIRECTIVES											
RANKING SCALE											
WEIGHING FACTOR											
VIS	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
	-	0	+	=							
■ DOES NOT MEET CRITICAL/MINIMUM CRITERIA											

HVPS REQUIREMENTS vs.  
 DESIGN  
 Basic form

Form HQ-13A Rev. 92

Figure 1  
 2.1.24

PROGRAM		DESIGN											
Item	(2)												
Prepared by													
Date(s)													
(6) ENGINEERING REQUIREMENTS		WEIGHING FACTORS											
ELECTRICAL	(4)											+/-0?	
THERMAL												(13)	
MECHANICAL												(11)	
PHYSICAL													
ENVIRONMENTAL													
RELIABILITY													
Maintainability													
TESTS													
COST													
SCHEDULE													
APPLICATION													
SAFETY													
TECHNICAL RISK													
SPECIFICATIONS													
CUSTOMER DIRECTIVES													
(5)													
		VTS											(12)
		? O											
		-											
		+											
		-											
RANKING SCALE													
WEIGHING FACTOR (10)													
* DOES NOT MEET CRITICAL/MINIMUM CRITERIA													
(1) HVPS REQUIREMENTS VS DESIGN Basic form													
(14) COMMENTS													

Figure 1.A

2.1.25

PROGRAM \_\_\_\_\_  
 Item \_\_\_\_\_  
 Prepared by \_\_\_\_\_  
 Date(s) \_\_\_\_\_

HPS REQUIREMENTS	ENGINEERING REQUIREMENTS	WEIGHING FACTORS	DESIGN-							COMMENTS
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
ELECTRICAL										
THERMAL										
MECHANICAL										
PHYSICAL										
ENVIRONMENTAL										
RELIABILITY										
MAINTAINABILITY										
TESTS										
COST										
SCHEDULE										
APPLICATION										
SAFETY										
TECHNICAL RISK										
SPECIFICATIONS										
CUSTOMER DIRECTIVES										

RANKING SCALE \_\_\_\_\_  
 WEIGHING FACTOR \_\_\_\_\_

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	+ - [0.7]
0							
I							
+							
-							

■ DOES NOT MEET CRITICAL/MINIMUM CRITERIA

## HVPS REQUIREMENTS VS. DESIGN

Extended form,  
expanded basic

Form HIG-1EX2 Rev. 92

Figure 2  
2.1.26

**PROGRAM** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Item** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Prepared by** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Date(s)** \_\_\_\_\_

## HVPS REQUIREMENTS vs. DESIGN Extended form, detailed

## COMMENTS

= DOES NOT MEET CRITICAL/MINIMUM CRITERIA

RANKING SCALE \_\_\_\_\_  
WEIGHING FACTOR \_\_\_\_\_

Form MMG-1EXL Rev. 92

Figure 3

**PROGRAM** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Item** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Prepared by** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Date(s)** \_\_\_\_\_

## HVPS REQUIREMENTS vs. DESIGN Open form

**Open form**

## COMMENTS

Form MHC-7SJL Rev. 92

**■ DOES NOT MEET CRITICAL/MINIMUM CRITERIA**

PROGRAM \_\_\_\_\_  
 Item \_\_\_\_\_  
 Prepared by \_\_\_\_\_  
 Dates(s) \_\_\_\_\_

PACKAGING ELEMENTS  
 vs. CANDIDATE DESIGNS  
 Basic form

PACKAGING ELEMENTS	ENGINEERING REQUIREMENTS	WEIGHING FACTORS	CANDIDATES/DESIGNS								COMMENTS
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
STRUCTURE										+ - 0 ?	
ELECTRICAL INSULATION											
THERMAL CONTROL											
INPUTS											
OUTPUTS											
INTERCONNECTION											
COMPONENTS											
ASSEMBLY											
TESTS											
Maintenance											
COST											
TECHNICAL RISK											
SPECIFICATIONS											
RANKING SCALE	VS	?	O	!	+	=					
WEIGHING FACTOR											

\* DOES NOT MEET CRITICAL/MINIMUM CRITERIA

Figure 5  
 2120

**PROGRAM** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Item** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Prepared by** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Dates(s)** \_\_\_\_\_

## PACKAGING ELEMENTS vs. CANDIDATE DESIGNS Open form

Open form

## COMMENTS

RANKING SCALE \_\_\_\_\_  
WEIGHING FACTOR \_\_\_\_\_

**■ DOES NOT MEET CRITICAL/MINIMUM CRITERIA**

Form NHO-7SU2 Rev. 92

Figure 6

PROGRAM \_\_\_\_\_  
 Item \_\_\_\_\_  
 Prepared by \_\_\_\_\_  
 Date(s) \_\_\_\_\_

COMPONENT REQUIREMENTS	ENGINEERING REQUIREMENTS	WEIGHING FACTORS	CANDIDATES						COMMENTS
			1	2	3	4	5	6	
ELECTRICAL								+ - 0 7	
THERMAL									
MECHANICAL									
PHYSICAL									
INTERCONNECTIONS									
LEADS									
ATTACHMENT									
ENVIRONMENTAL									
RELIABILITY									
DERATING									
MAINTAINABILITY									
SAFETY									
SPECIFICATIONS									
COST									
AVAILABILITY									
TECHNICAL RISK									
CUSTOMER DIRECTIVES									
RANKING SCALE _____									
WEIGHING FACTOR _____									
		WEIGHING FACTOR	1	2	3	4	5	6	
			?	-	0	+	*		
			DOES NOT MEET CRITICAL/MINIMUM CRITERIA						

COMPONENT REQUIREMENTS  
vs. CANDIDATES  
Basic form

**PROGRAM** \_\_\_\_\_  
**ITEM** \_\_\_\_\_  
**PREPARED BY** \_\_\_\_\_  
**DATE(S)** \_\_\_\_\_

PROGRAM _____	ITEM _____	PREPARED BY _____	DATE(S) _____	CANDIDATES										COMMENTS
				WEIGHING FACTORS										
COMPONENT REQUIREMENTS	ENGINEERING REQUIREMENTS											+ - O ?		
	ELECTRICAL													
	THERMAL													
	MECHANICAL													
	PHYSICAL													
	INTERCONNECTIONS													
	LEADS													
	ATTACHMENT													
	ENVIRONMENTAL													
	RELIABILITY													
	DERATING													
	Maintainability													
	SAFETY													
	SPECIFICATIONS													
	COST													
	AVAILABILITY													
	TECHNICAL RISK													
	CUSTOMER DIRECTIVES													

**Figure 8**

**PROGRAM** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Item** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Prepared by** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Dates(s)** \_\_\_\_\_

**COMPONENT REQUIREMENTS  
vs. CANDIDATES**  
Extended form,  
detailed, general

COMPARISON REQUIREMENTS	ENGINEERING REQUIREMENTS	WEIGHT	RANKING SCALE		COMMENTS
			+	-	
ELECTRICAL					
V RATED					
V OPERATE					
V BD					
VCC (CORONA CHAR)					
POWER					
EFFICIENCY (DISSIPATION)					
TRANSIENTS					
FREQUENCY					
PHASES					
FAULT RENTS/TOLERANCE					
THERMAL					
T OPERATE					
T MAX					
T MIN					
STRESS EFFECTS					
CONTROL REQUIREMENTS/METHODS					
MECHANICAL					
STRENGTH/ADEQUACY					
ATTACHMENT					
STRESSES					
SHOCK					
VIBRATION					
THERMAL					
PHYSICAL					
SIZE					
GEOMETRY					
WEIGHT					
INTERCONNECTIONS					
INPUTS					
OUTPUTS					
NUMBERS					
METHODS					
LEADS					
MATERIAL					
FINISH					
SOLDERABILITY					
STRENGTH					
ENVIRONMENTAL					
HUMIDITY					
SOLVENTS					
ESD					
RFI					
RADIATION					
RELIABILITY					
MIL SPEC					
OTHER					
DERATING					
ELECTRICAL					
TEMPERATURE					
MAINTAINABILITY					
METHOD					
FREQUENCY					
SAFETY					
PERSONNEL					
USE/ENVIRON.					
SPECIFICATIONS					
CUSTOM					
MILITARY					
COMPANY					
COST					
AVAILABILITY					
TECHNICAL RISK					
NEW DEVICE					
NEW APPLICATION					
CUSTOMER DIRECTIVES					

**■ DOES NOT MEET CRITICAL/MINIMUM CRITERIA**

Figure 9

Program \_\_\_\_\_  
 Item \_\_\_\_\_  
 Prepared by \_\_\_\_\_  
 Date(s) \_\_\_\_\_

COMPONENT REQUIREMENTS CAPACITORS	DESIGNING REQUIREMENTS	WEIGHING FACTORS	CANDIDATES										COMMENTS
			+/-10%	+/-10%	+/-10%	+/-10%	+/-10%	+/-10%	+/-10%	+/-10%	+/-10%	+/-10%	
ELECTRICAL													
V <sub>op</sub>													
V <sub>start</sub>													
CIV. DCV ac													
CIV. DCV dc													
C. TOL.													
DF AT OP FREQ													
DF TEMP. RANGE													
DF FREQ.													
INSULATION RESIST.													
STABILITY TEMP. RANGE													
STABILITY OF LIFE													
ESR													
SMP													
PF													
SURGE RESPONSE													
ENERGY STORAGE													
THERMAL													
TDP, MAX													
TDP, DP.													
TDP, RANGE													
SHOCK-RANGE/CYCLES													
CYCLE-RANGE/CYCLES													
CTE													
MECHANICAL													
STRESS, MAJOR AXIS													
STRESS, MINOR AXIS													
ATTACHMENT METHOD													
SUPPORTS													
SHOCK - MAX													
VIBRATION - MAX													
PHYSICAL													
SIZE - DIMA													
SIZE - VOL													
CONFIG. LIMITS													
WEIGHT													
INTERCONNECTIONS/LEADS													
HUMIDITY													
LOCATION													
SIZE/COD													
MATERIALS													
PROCESS METHOD													
ENVIRONMENTAL													
MOISTURE RESIST.													
SOLVENT RESIST.													
PROCESS COMPAT.													
ALTITUDE/PRESSURE													
VACUUM													
RELIABILITY													
FAILURE RATE													
FAILURE MODE													
OP. LIFE													
STORAGE LIFE													
FAULT TOLERANCE													
DEGRADING FACTORS													
V <sub>op</sub>													
DF. TEMP.													
DESIGN FACTORS													
ELECTRIC STRESS MAX													
ELECTRIC STRESS OP.													
ENERGY DENSITY, VT.													
ENERGY DENSITY, VOL.													
PACKAGING													
ASSEMBLY COMPAT.													
MANTAINABILITY													
REWORK COMPAT.													
SPECIFICATIONS													
CUSTOMERS													
KOL SPECS													
COMPANY													
SAFETY/HEALTH													
SPEC. HANDLING													
SPEC. STORAGE													
PORSONNEL													
ENVIRONMENT													
COST													
DEVELOPMENT													
UNIT PRICE													
SPEC. TESTS													
ATTRITION													
STORAGE													
AVAILABILITY													
STA. PRODUCT													
INTERCHANGEABLE													
SOLID SOURCE													
STABILITY MFR.													
SCHEDULE													
DEVELOPMENT													
IMPLEMENT													
PRODUCTION													
TECHNICAL RISK													
NEW DEVICE													
NEW APPLICATION													
NEW MFR.													
CUSTOMER DIRECTIVES													
REQUIRED TYPES													
SUGGESTED TYPES													
PROHIBITED TYPES													
None													

= DOES NOT MEET CRITICAL/IMPORTANT CRITERIA

1 2 3 4

## COMPONENT REQUIREMENTS vs. CANDIDATES

Extended form, detailed,  
Capacitors

PROGRAM \_\_\_\_\_  
 Item \_\_\_\_\_  
 Prepared by \_\_\_\_\_  
 Date(s) \_\_\_\_\_

COMPONENT REQUIREMENTS - SOURCES	ENGINEERING REQUIREMENTS	WEIGHTING FACTORS	CANDIDATES								COMMENTS																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																	
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																		
											+ - 0?																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																	

PROGRAM \_\_\_\_\_  
 Item \_\_\_\_\_  
 Prepared by \_\_\_\_\_  
 Date(s) \_\_\_\_\_

COMPONENT REQUIREMENTS - RESISTORS	ENGINEERING REQUIREMENTS	WEIGHING FACTORS	CANDIDATES								COMMENTS
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
ELECTRICAL										+0.7	
V DEVICE											
V DEVICE - GND											
CV, DEV ac DEVICE											
CV, DEV ac DEVICE - GND											
CV, CCL ac DEVICE											
CV, CCL ac DEVICE - GND											
R TIL											
ΔR DP, TEMP RANGE											
ΔR AT Vop, Vtest											
STABILITY											
TRACKING											
NOISE											
INDUCTANCE & DP, FREQ											
POWER DISSIP.											
Thermal											
TEMP, MAX											
TEMP, DP,											
TEMP, RANGE											
SHOCK-RANGE/CYCLES											
CYCLE-RANGE/CYCLES											
HEAT TRANSFER											
Mechanical											
STRESS, MAJOR AXIS											
STRESS, MINOR AXIS											
ATTACHMENT METHOD											
SUPPORTS											
SHOCK - MAX											
VIBRATION - MAX											
Thermal Stress											
Physical											
SIZE - DIMN.											
SIZE - VOL.											
CONFIG. LIMITS											
WEIGHT											
INTERCONNECTIONS/LEADS											
NUMBERS											
LOCATIONS											
SIZES											
MATERIALS											
PROCESS METHODS											
ENVIRONMENTAL											
MOISTURE RESIST.											
SOLVENT RESIST.											
PROCESS COMPAT.											
RADIATION RESIST.											
ALTITUDE/PRESSURE											
VACUUM											
RELIABILITY											
FAILURE RATES											
FAILURE MODE											
OP. LIFE											
STORAGE LIFE											
FAULT TOLERANCE											
FAULT PROTECTION											
DEGRADED FACTORS											
P											
OP. TEMP.											
DESIGN FACTORS											
SINGLE DEVICE											
SERIES DEVICES											
PACKAGING											
CASE TYPE											
ASSEMBLY COMPAT.											
MANTAINABILITY											
REWORK COMPAT.											
SPECIFICATIONS											
CUSTOMER											
MIL. SPECS.											
COMPANY											
COST											
DEVELOPMENT											
UNIT PRICE											
SPC TESTS											
ATTRITION											
STORAGE											
AVAILABILITY											
STD. PRODUCT											
INTERCHANGABLE											
SOLE SOURCE											
STABILITY MFL											
SCHEMATIC											
IMPLEMENT											
PRODUCTION											
TECHNICAL RISK											
REV. DEVICE											
REV. APPLICATION											
REV. MFL											
CUSTOMER DIRECTIVES											
REQUIRED TYPES											
SUGGESTED TYPES											
PROHIBITED TYPES											
NONE											

RANKING SCALE \_\_\_\_\_  
 WEIGHING FACTOR \_\_\_\_\_

WEIGHING FACTORS

1 yrs  
 0 yrs  
 -1 yrs  
 + yrs  
 = yrs

■ DOES NOT MEET CRITICAL/MINIMUM CRITERIA

COMPONENT REQUIREMENTS  
 vs. CANDIDATES  
 Extended form, detailed,  
 Resistors

## COMPONENT REQUIREMENTS vs. CANDIDATES

## CANDIDATES

Extended form, detailed,  
Transformers

## COMMENTS

2.1.37 Figure 13

PROGRAM \_\_\_\_\_  
ITEM \_\_\_\_\_  
PREPARED BY \_\_\_\_\_  
DATE(S) \_\_\_\_\_

## COMPONENT REQUIREMENTS vs. CANDIDATES

Figure 14

PROGRAM \_\_\_\_\_  
 Item \_\_\_\_\_  
 Prepared by \_\_\_\_\_  
 Date(s) \_\_\_\_\_

MATERIALS REQUIREMENTS	ENGINEERING REQUIREMENTS	WEIGHING FACTORS	CANDIDATES										COMMENTS
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
ELECTRICAL											+ - 0 ?		
THERMAL													
MECHANICAL													
PHYSICAL													
THERMO-DYNAMIC													
ENVIRONMENTAL													
PROCESSING													
Maintainability													
Reliability													
Safety/Health													
Specifications													
Cost													
Availability													
Reproducibility													
Technical Risk													
Use Limits													
Customer Directives													
RANKING SCALE _____		VIS	?	O	-	=	+						
WEIGHING FACTOR _____		DOES NOT MEET CRITICAL/MINIMUM CRITERIA											

MATERIALS REQUIREMENTS  
 vs. CANDIDATES  
 Basic form

Figure 15

**PROGRAM** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Item** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Prepared by** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Date(s)** \_\_\_\_\_

## MATERIALS REQUIREMENTS vs. CANDIDATES

Extended form,  
Gases

RANKING SCALE \_\_\_\_\_  
WEIGHING FACTOR \_\_\_\_\_

**■ DOES NOT MEET CRITICAL/MINIMUM CRITERIA**

Form MHD-1EX3 Rev. 92

PROGRAM \_\_\_\_\_  
 Item \_\_\_\_\_  
 Prepared by \_\_\_\_\_  
 Date(s) \_\_\_\_\_

MATERIALS REQUIREMENTS - LIQUIDS	WEIGHING FACTORS	CANDIDATES							COMMENTS
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
ELECTRICAL									+ - 0 ?
Emin. OP.									
Emax TEST									
Eavg. OP.									
Eavg TEST									
Emin TEMP. RANGE									
Eavg TEMP. RANGE									
CIV. CEV. ac									
CIV. CEV. dc									
Vmax OP.									
Vmax TEST									
Dielectric Const. @ OP. FREQ									
Insulation Factors @ OP. FREQ									
Insulation Factors @ TEMP. RANGE									
Volume Resist TEMP. RANGE									
THERMAL									
TEMP. MAX									
TEMP. OP.									
TEMP. RANGE OP.									
TEMP. RANGE DUAL									
Thermal Conductivity									
Specific Heat									
Reynolds Number									
Flow Rate									
Thermal Expan. Coeff.									
PHYSICAL									
Density									
Viscosity									
Freeze Pt.									
Vapor Pressure									
MECHANICAL									
Container									
Sealing									
ENVIRONMENTAL									
Moisture Tolerance									
Solvent Tolerance									
Chemical Compatibility									
Corona Effects									
Arc Effects									
Construction Matls.									
Components									
Reliability									
Corona Effects									
Arc Resist									
OP. LIFE									
Storage Life									
Maintainability									
Access									
Disposal									
Refill									
Seal/Closure									
Environ. Reqs.									
Processing									
Design Compats.									
Safety/Health									
Toxicity									
Flammability									
Chemical React.									
Specifications									
Customers									
Mil. Specs.									
Company									
Cost									
Development									
Implementation									
Manufacturing									
Maintenance									
Schedule									
Development									
Implement									
Production									
Technical Risk									
New Material									
New Application									
Both									
Customer Directives									
Required									
Recommended									
Prohibited									
Restricted Use									
None									
Tests									
Materials Controls									
In-Process Monitoring									
Completed Assy Chrg									
RANKING SCALE									
WEIGHING FACTOR									

VIS  
?  
O  
I  
+  
-

\* DOES NOT MEET CRITICAL/MINIMUM CRITERIA

MATERIALS REQUIREMENTS  
vs. CANDIDATES  
Extended form,  
Liquids

**PROGRAM** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Item** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Prepared by** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Date(s)** \_\_\_\_\_

## MATERIALS REQUIREMENTS vs. CANDIDATES

Extended form,  
Solids

RANKING SCALE \_\_\_\_\_  
WEIGHING FACTOR \_\_\_\_\_

**■ DOES NOT MEET CRITICAL/MINIMUM CRITERIA**

Form HQ-4EXI Rev. 92

**PROGRAM** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Item** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Prepared by** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Date(s)** \_\_\_\_\_

PROGRAM _____		CANDIDATES							
Item _____									
Prepared by _____									
Date(s) _____									
MATERIALS REQUIREMENTS									

## MATERIALS REQUIREMENTS vs. CANDIDATES

Open form

Open form

Open form

## COMMENTS

RANKING SCALE \_\_\_\_\_  
WEIGHING FACTOR \_\_\_\_\_


Form MM-7514 May, 1922

Figure 19

Figure 20  
2.1.44

PROGRAM \_\_\_\_\_  
Prepared by \_\_\_\_\_  
Date(s) \_\_\_\_\_

INTERACTION IDENTIFICATION



COMMENTS

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

PROGRAM \_\_\_\_\_  
Prepared by \_\_\_\_\_  
Date(s) \_\_\_\_\_

## INTERACTION IDENTIFICATION

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30
1																														
2																														
3																														
4																														
5																														
6																														
7																														
8																														
9																														
10																														
11																														
12																														
13																														
14																														
15																														
16																														
17																														
18																														
19																														
20																														
21																														
22																														
23																														
24																														
25																														
26																														
27																														
28																														
29																														
30																														

COMMENTS

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**PROGRAM** \_\_\_\_\_

Prepared by \_\_\_\_\_

Date(s) \_\_\_\_\_

## Model Test Structure (MTS) Variables Summary

Figure 23

PROGRAM \_\_\_\_\_  
Prepared by \_\_\_\_\_  
Date(s) \_\_\_\_\_

Model Test Structure (MTS)  
Variables Summary

MTS	VARIABLES	TO BE EVALUATED	COMMENTS
	1.		
	2.		
	3.		
	4.		

Figure 23A.

PROGRAM \_\_\_\_\_  
Item \_\_\_\_\_  
Prepared by \_\_\_\_\_  
Date(s) \_\_\_\_\_

## WORKSHEET

Figure 24.

**PROGRAM.** \_\_\_\_\_

## COMMENTARY

Prepared by \_\_\_\_\_

Date(s) \_\_\_\_\_

Figure 25.

PERIODIC MAN-TECH  
ITEM EXAMPLE  
Prepared by                     
Dated 8-23-92

MAN-TECH EXAMPLE		DESIGN-APPROACH										HVPS REQUIREMENTS VS. DESIGN	
		WEIGHING FACTORS		GAS		SOLID		LIQUID		VAPOR		Basic form	
ENGINEERING REQUIREMENTS		1	6	1	5	1	5	1	5	1	5	COMMENTS	
ELECTRICAL		1	6	1	5							+ - 0.7	
THERMAL		0.5	4	6.0									
MECHANICAL		3	4	6.4									
PHYSICAL		0.7	4.2	4.4									
ENVIRONMENTAL		0.7	3.6	3.5									
RELIABILITY		1.	9	6									
MAINTAINABILITY		0.2	1.8	0.2									
TESTS		1.9	3.2	3.2									
COST		0.9	3.4	3.6									
SCHEDULE		1.5	2.5	4.0									
APPLICATION		1.6	4.8	4.8									
SAFETY		0	0	0									
TECHNICAL RISK		0.3	2.0	1.2									
SPECIFICATIONS		2	1.6	1.6									
CUSTOMER DIRECTIVES		0	0	0									

**ASSIGNED VALUE = W.F. X RANK VALUE**

PERFECT DESIGN - 81.

PROGRAM MAN-TECH HVPS  
ITEM HV-FACILITY A-3  
PREPARED BY [Signature]  
DATE(DD) 17 (MM) 72 (YY)

I/P'S REQUIREMENTS		DESIGN- EFFECTIVENESS			
ENGINEERING REQUIREMENTS		WEIGHING FACTORS			
		SOLID	LIP	GARS	PROCESS-SELECTED
ELECTRICAL	1. P.	+	+	0	+
	2. SPC				
THERMAL	1. D. & AIR	+	+	0	+
	2. E. & H.				
MECHANICAL	1. VIB. SHOCK	+	0	=	0
	2. C. & DUR.				
PHYSICAL	1. D. & WT.	0	0	-	0
	2. E. & H.				
ENVIRONMENTAL	1. Q. POLLUT.	+	+	+	+
	2. E. & H.				
RELIABILITY	1. D. & DUR.	0	+	+	+
	2. E. & H.				
MAINTAINABILITY	1. D. & DUR.	=	0	+	+
	2. E. & H.				
TEST	1. SENSITIVITY	0	0	-	0
	2. E. & H.				
COST	1. D. & DUR.	-	0	-	+
	2. E. & H.				
MANAGEABLE	1. D. & DUR.	+	0	-	0
	2. E. & H.				
APPLICATION	1. D. & DUR.	+	+	-	0
	2. E. & H.				
SAFETY	1. D. & DUR.	0	0	0	0
	2. E. & H.				
TECHNICAL RISK	1. D. & DUR.	+	+	-	0
	2. E. & H.				
SPECIFICATIONS	1. D. & DUR.	+	0	-	0
	2. E. & H.				
CUST. DIR.	1. D. & DUR.	+	*	0	0
	2. E. & H.				

卷之三

Figure 27.  
2.1.52

MAN-TECH HVPS

PROGRAM MAN 1  
Item \_\_\_\_\_  
Prepared by G. A. SIEGEL  
Date (s) 14/10/1963

RANKING SCALE \_\_\_\_\_  
WORKING FACTOR 0-10

0	18	11
1	45	11
+	19	49

## HVPS REQUIREMENTS vs. DESIGN Basic form

## COMMENTS

Figure 28.  
2.1.53

MAN-TECH HYPS

PROGRAM MAN 126  
FORM 6A  
PROMPTER  
DATE 14 AUG 93

BALANCE SCALE 0-10

**WORD FACTOR** \_\_\_\_\_

**• SEEK AND MEET CRITICAL/REGULAR CRITERIA**

## HVPS REQUIREMENTS vs. DESIGN Basic form

## COMMENTS

Figure 29.

PROGRAM MAN-TECH HVPS  
Prepared by SD  
Date(s) 18 Aug 93

## INTERACTION IDENTIFICATION

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30
1	PWB'S - HV	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
2																														
3	transformer coils	<input type="checkbox"/>																												
4																														
5	HV CERAMIC CAPS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input type="checkbox"/>																									
6																														
7	reusable snap	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input type="checkbox"/>																						
8																														
9	HV trans. insul.	<input type="checkbox"/>						<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>																				
10																														
11	trans. insul. across	<input type="checkbox"/>					<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																				
12																														
13	HV diodes - titans.	<input type="checkbox"/>				<input type="checkbox"/>												<input type="checkbox"/>												
14																														
15	HV connection - strips	<input type="checkbox"/>														<input type="checkbox"/>														
16																														
17																														
18																														
19																														
20																														
21																														
22																														
23																														
24																														
25																														
26																														
27																														
28																														
29																														
30																														

## COMMENTS

multilayer ceramic chip cap's - not single layer

PROGRAM MAN-TECH HVPS  
 Prepared by G H  
 Date(s) 18 Aug. 43

Model Test Structure (MTS)  
 Variables Summary

MTS HV PWBS

VARIABLES	TO BE EVALUATED	COMMENTS
Substrate. MFR' "TBC	constant	"
Cu - one side	constant	
- two sides		
multi-layer design		
conductors geometries	*	
" dimensions	*	
" thickness		
" material		
substrate surface finish		
substrate surf. heat treat		
temperature to thru-holes	*	
thru-holes - type		
thru-holes - sizes		
components - sizes		
" - shapes		
" - function		
Vop - substrate thermal conduct.	*	
" - thru-substrate thermal stresses		
mechanical stresses		
environmental stressed		
RESPONSES		
CV, PEV - see ed.		
VAD, DC		
life time @ Vdc & T <sub>05</sub>		

PROGRAM MAIN-TECH HVPS  
Item HV THERMIC ENERGY SPLITTER  
Prepared by J. L. F.  
Dates 1-15-93

## WORKSHEET

#### **5. IDEAS NOT MEET CERTAIN QUALITY CRITERIA**

2. WIES MÖGLICHST GUTE QUALITÄT ERHALBT

Figure 32.  
2.1.57

## Cen Base / Materials \* Database Information

# Over 50,000 pages of Engineering Materials Property Data

*on a single computer disc!*



## Over 17,000 Materials from over 300 Manufacturers

•Thermoplastics • Thermosets • Elastomers & Rubbers • Composites • Ceramics • Fibers • Metals • Over 500 properties • Applications & Uses  
•Chemical Resistance • Material Safety Data Sheets • Advanced Engineering Graphs and Tables

With a subscription to CenBASE/Materials on CD-ROM, complex materials research can be completed in minutes. No more digging through old manufacturers' catalogs or waiting for new

*"An Invaluable tool..."*, literature

*Cal Tech Plastics* to reach you by

mail. With only a few keystrokes, you can find the materials that meet your precise design requirements, print the results and save your search in the same time it takes to

make a cup of coffee!

Our full-time staff of materials engineers and editors update the database on a daily basis and the discs are published

*Materials Engineering Magazine*

four times per year. We have been maintaining this database since 1984 with an average of 2000 new materials being added to the database every year and 35% of the data being revised or deleted. The data is captured directly from manufacturers'

catalogs and carefully edited into the database using specifically designed templates and procedures.

Our coverage is complete, because *CenBASE/Materials* is a

FULL TEXT database on CD-ROM (600MB capacity).

CenBASE/Materials is available for IBM PCs, Macintosh, Sun Workstations and VAX servers running PC/SA. Our very own "award winning" Infotrieve™ retrieval

software is included on every disc. Infotrieve™ fully supports Dot Matrix, HP Laser and PostScript laser printers. We also support all types of networked systems like PC LANS, Unix and VAX/VMS.

*"I highly recommend it..."*,  
**3M Corporate Library**

Subscription prices range from \$1,450/yr to \$14,000/yr



Information Indexing, Inc.

12832 Valley View Street, Garden Grove, California 92645 (800) 888-0608 Tel (714) 893-2471 Fax (714) 893-0838

# CenBASE/Materials™ Subscription and License Agreement

Subscriptions and shipments are subject to the terms and conditions contained herein, including a limitation of warranty and limitation of liability. Based on the terms and conditions herein, we hereby order the type of subscriptions indicated below to CenBASE/Materials ("the Product"). We understand that the Product will be delivered to us within 30 days after the release of the current edition of

System Type	Annual Subscription Fees
Single User IBM PC or Macintosh (Updated Annually, 1 disc per year)	<input type="checkbox"/> \$1,450/yr
Single User IBM PC (Updated Quarterly, 4 discs per year)	<input type="checkbox"/> \$3,500/yr
Novell PC Lans Unix Workstations VAX/VMS Mainframes (Updated Quarterly, 4 discs per year, Includes installation and one day of training.)	<input type="checkbox"/> \$7,500/yr <input type="checkbox"/> \$7,500/yr <input type="checkbox"/> \$14,000/yr

Purchase Order \_\_\_\_\_ Order Date \_\_\_\_\_

Authorizing Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Title \_\_\_\_\_

## 1. Parties to the Agreement

The parties to this Agreement are Information Indexing, Inc. (hereinafter "The Licensor"), and the Licensee identified on this Agreement.

## 2. The Product

The CenBASE/Materials Database ("the Product"), consists of the Database stored on CD/ROM (High Sierra/ISO 9660), installed on the above selected system, a user's manual, and the software required to access the Database.

## 3. The License

Licensor hereby grants the Licensee a non-transferable, nonexclusive license to use the Product according to the terms and conditions of the Agreement, which license shall terminate twelve months after delivery of the Product to the Licensee, unless extended by Licensor for an additional term. Licensee shall use the Product only for internal purposes, shall not use the product as a component of, or basis for, a directory or database prepared for commercial sale or distribution outside of the Licensee's organization and shall neither duplicate the Product nor alter the Product in any way.

## 4. Ownership of the Data and the Software

Data and the Software are owned by Infodex, the Licensor, and no right to use Database in this form or any part thereof is conveyed to Licensee except the right to use it for the purpose of performing research. Licensee may view the data on their terminal or may print selected data by printer and may make limited copies of such print-out solely for such purposes. Portions of the data may be copied onto electronic or magnetic media or other machine readable form solely for temporary use or storage in such research. In no event may persons other than the Licensee, its employees and its clients be permitted to use the data in its delivered form. In no event may the Database in its entirety or in lengthy sequences be downloaded for sale by Licensee to a third party.

## 5. Telephone Support

For one year from the date of delivery of the Product, Licensor will have consultants available by telephone during normal business hours to answer questions and provide assistance to the Licensee. Any such assistance will be at Licensee's sole risk and Licensor shall not be liable for any loss or damages arising therefrom.

## 6. Confidentiality

Licensee shall take all necessary action whether by instruction, agreement, or otherwise, to restrict and control the use, copying, protection and security of the Product data, software, documentation and other support materials among the Licensee's employees and prevent access except to those permitted to have access by the terms of this Agreement.

## 7. Product Updates

The product ordered on this Agreement will be updated according to the schedule selected on the first page of this Agreement. The updates will be in the form of completely new media with new and revised information. "Updated Quarterly" means the Licensee will receive (4) four entirely new discs throughout the year.

## 8. Lost, CD/ROM Discs

Lost media will be replaced at a cost of \$200 per set. Defective media will be replaced at no charge.

## 9. Warranties

Licensor warrants and represents that it has the complete right to enter into this Agreement and to deliver the Product. THE FOREGOING WARRANTY IS LIEU OF ANY AND ALL OTHER WARRANTIES, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, INCLUDING WITHOUT LIMITATION, WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE. LICENSOR NEITHER ASSUMES NOR AUTHORIZES ANY OTHER PERSON TO ASSUME FOR LICENSOR ANY OTHER LIABILITY IN CONNECTION WITH THE LICENSING OF THE PRODUCT UNDER THIS AGREEMENT. ALTHOUGH CARE IS USED IN PREPARING THE DATABASE CONTAINED IN THE PRODUCT, LICENSOR DISCLAIMS ANY LIABILITY FOR ACCURACY THEREOF. LICENSOR AND THE SUPPLIERS OF THE DATABASE ASSUME NO RESPONSIBILITY WITH RESPECT TO THE LICENSEE'S USE OF THE PRODUCT AND SHALL NOT BE LIABLE FOR LOSS OF PROFITS, LOSS OF USE OR INCIDENTAL, CONSEQUENTIAL OR EXEMPLARY DAMAGES, EVEN IF AWARE OF THE POSSIBILITY THEREOF. IN NO EVENT MAY EITHER LICENSOR OR LICENSEE BRING ANY CLAIM OR CAUSE OF ACTION AGAINST THE OTHER MORE

the Product and receipt of a signed purchase order or prepayment of the subscription fee plus handling charges and taxes, where applicable, is required and that our license to the Product will terminate 12 months after delivery of the Product. Sign and send with your Purchase Order to: **Information Indexing, 12872 Valley View St, #10, Garden Grove, CA 92645**

Bill To Company _____
Attn _____
Address _____
City _____ State _____ Zip _____
Phone _____
Ship To Company _____
Attn _____
Address _____
City _____ State _____ Zip _____
Phone _____

THAN ONE YEAR AFTER SUCH CLAIM OR CAUSE OF ACTION ARISES. LICENSOR SHALL IN NO EVENT BE LIABLE FOR MORE THAN THE LICENSE FEE THEN PAID FOR THE PRODUCT. (WHETHER LICENSOR'S LIABILITY ARISES FROM BREACH OF WARRANTY, BREACH OF ANY OBLIGATION ARISING FROM BREACH OF WARRANTY, OTHER BREACH OF THIS CONTRACT, OR OTHERWISE AND WHETHER LIABILITY IS EXPRESSED IN CONTRACT OR IN TORT, INCLUDING NEGLIGENCE AND STRICT LIABILITY). SOME STATES DO NOT ALLOW THE EXCLUSION OR LIMITATION OF THE IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF LIABILITY FOR INCIDENTAL OR CONSEQUENTIAL DAMAGES, SO THE ABOVE LIMITATION MAY NOT APPLY TO EACH LICENSEE.

## 10. Term

The term of this Agreement shall be one year from the date of shipment by Licensor to Licensee and this Agreement shall be renewed for successive one year terms at the fees current on the renewal date unless Licensee or Licensor gives notice at least 60 days in advance of the expiration of the then current term.

## 11. Termination of License

If Licensee breaches any term of this Agreement, in addition to all other legal remedies, Licensor may terminate the License granted hereunder. Upon termination of the License by Licensor or Licensee for any reason, Licensee shall, unless otherwise agreed to in writing by Licensor, return to Licensor the Product and all copies thereof, whether modified, merged or included with other data or software and shall certify in writing to Licensor that Licensee has not retained the Product or copies thereof. The provisions of this contract which protect the proprietary rights of the Licensor shall continue in force after termination.

## 12. Indemnification

Licensee agrees to indemnify and hold Licensor harmless from and against any and all claims of third parties (including without limitation for copyright infringement) arising out of or related to the use of the Product by Licensee.

## 13. Notices

All notices, consents or other communications referred to herein shall be in writing, and shall be sent to the other party by first class mail addressed to that party at the address specified in this Agreement or to such alternate address as either party may furnish in writing to the other.

## 14. No Assignment by Licensee

This Agreement, and the License contained herein, may not be assigned by Licensee.

## 15. Force Majeure

Licensor shall not be responsible for any failure to perform (or delay to perform), in whole or in part, due to unforeseen circumstances or circumstances beyond the Licensor's control, including but not limited to acts of God, war, riot, embargoes, acts of civil or military authority, fire, flood, accidents, strikes, and shortages of transportation facilities, fuel, labor or materials.

## 16. Entire Understanding

This Agreement represents the entire understanding of the parties with respect to the subject matter thereof, and there are no representations, promises, warranties, covenants or understandings with respect thereto other than those contained in this Agreement. Without limiting the generality of the foregoing, it is expressly agreed that the terms of any purchase order issued by Licensee with respect to this Agreement of the Product shall not be applicable and that any acceptance of such purchase order by Licensor shall be for acknowledgement purposes only.

## 17. Illegality and Unenforceability

If a term or condition of this Agreement is found by a court or administrative agency to be invalid or unenforceable, the remaining terms and conditions shall be enforceable to the full extent permitted by law.

## 18. Law

This Agreement shall be governed by and construed in accordance with the laws of California without giving effect to the principles of conflict of law thereof.

# The CenBASE/Materials Monthly

## Engineering Materials Database

on CD-ROM (Compact Disc Read Only Memory)

Plastics, Rubbers, Composites, Ceramics, Metals.

Properties, Applications & Uses, Chemical Resistance, MSDS & More

Vol. 1, No. 4

April 1991

## 1,430 New Materials added to the 2Q91 disc!

## Over 170 megabytes or 50,000 pages of materials engineering data.

During last three months the editorial focus was to increase our coverage of the metals industry while at the same time keeping up with the changing plastics industry. We have begun a project to capture pertinent metals specification data from MIL-HDBK-5E. This is a military handbook produced and published by the Department of Defense in coordination with industry, Air Force, Navy, Army and the FAA on metal-

lic materials for aerospace vehicle structures. The 2Q91 disc includes over 106 detailed records on standard grades of metals with physical property data, application text and cross-referenced ASTM, AMS, AA, FEDERAL, SAE, and MILITARY specifications. Future efforts will include the capturing of engineering plots for stress, fatigue, temperature plots, etc. Load search sequence named

"ONEW.SEQ" or search the descriptions for "\*".

### Infotrieve™ Version 1.2

Our programming department has also been busy improving the retrieval software included on every CD-ROM disc. Version 1.2 includes a new two level interface to the massive property index. This new feature will allow users to find desired properties and perform min/max searches easier than in version 1.1. The two level interface first drops you into an outline index of all available properties. You search for a desired property and then press enter to expand that property (level 2) to select your desired min/max. In level 1, the system displays a frequency count that clues you in on what properties are being used the most, (very helpful for searching on commonly used properties). Property index is now sorted in ascending order versus descending. This also helps users interact with the massive property index.

Other new features include:

**Wildcard Searching.** The ability to wildcard a search request using the ? key. Example: DELRIN? ,

**NOT EQUAL searching.** You can specify this request anytime after the first search pass.

**Subscript out of range error.** This problem has been fixed in version 1.2.

This newsletter is published every month by the editors of the CenBASE/Materials Database and Information Indexing, Inc.

Chris E. Nunez  
President/Publisher



Information Indexing, Inc.  
12832 Valley View Street  
Garden Grove, CA 92645  
(714) 893-2471  
(800) 888-0608

### New Materials added by the following manufacturer's

#### PLASTICS

3M	38
Allied	2
Amoco Chemical	10
Aristech	81
BF Goodrich	24
BP Chemical	72
Colorite	7
Cyanamid	32
Cyro Industries	3
Dixon	4
Dow Chemical	10
Dupont	15
Eastman	22
Ferro	28
Fiberite	4
GE Plastics	7
Georgia Pacific	5
Hercules	1
Hoechst Celanese	32
Huntsman	8
M.A. Polymer	2
Monsanto	18
Novacor	11
Occidental	3
Paxon Polymer	6
Phillips	3
Polymerland	5
Rexene	22
Rototron	1
RTP Co	150

#### CERAMICS

Ceratlox	7
Certech	1
Coors	13
Eagle-Picher	6
ERG	1

#### ESK

Hi Tech	9
Huts	15
Leco	4
TAM	18
Wisconsin	5

#### METALS

AI Tech	10
Alcan	14
Alloy Metals	24
Alloy Tech	11
Ampco	1
Armco	8
Cabot	14
Cerro	9
Climax	30
CMP	6
Crucible	12
Fansteel	3
Gulf States	6
Harrison	47
Haynes	23
Hoskins	9
IRI	12
Kaiser	1
Lone Star	19
Metglas	8
Nuclear Metals	5
PMA	35
QT	5
Reynolds	210
SCM	26
SPS	1
Teladyne	1
Uddeholm	1
SPECS (MIL-HDBK-5E)	106

## Welcome, New CenBASE/Materials subscribers

Harvey Mudd College, Claremont, CA  
University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA  
University of Texas, El Paso, TX  
University of Akron, Akron OH  
FMC Corporation, Santa Clara, CA  
Alliant Techsystems, Hopkins, MN  
Orscheln Co, Moberly, MO  
Hughes Aircraft Co., El Segundo, CA  
Naval Civil Engineering Library, Port Hueneme, CA  
RJF International, Brecksville, OH  
FDA, Alexandria, VA  
Sherwood Medical Inc, St Louis, MO  
Shell Development, Houston, TX

## Hughes/Northrop (El Segundo, CA) select CenBASE/Materials as system of choice

A recent study of materials databases was performed by Susan Oldhan of Hughes Aircraft, Electro-Optical Group in El Segundo, CA. The study concluded that CenBASE was the most complete and flexible source of materials data available. The study compared CenBASE to online systems, floppy disk systems and printed publications. The project was stimulated by research and development efforts in high voltage power supplies and the unique electrical property requirements of its components.

## FAST CD-ROM DRIVES

Toshiba introduces new 330ms fast access CD-ROM drives at rock bottom prices!

The Toshiba XM3201 external and internal for IBM AT, PS/2 and Macintosh computers. SCSI interface card, cable and CD extensions software. LAN compatible and fully High Sierra/ISO compliant. 600MB storage capacity and fast data access.

\$599.00

### Authorized CenBASE/Materials Sales Representatives

We are pleased to introduce three new "Authorized CenBASE/Materials Sales Representatives". These persons are now available to better serve our growing customer base and to provide on-site demonstrations of CenBASE/Materials and its use of CD-ROM technology.

#### East coast & New England Area (MA, CT, NY, NJ, MD, VA)

Sue Roland  
PC Plus Inc.  
12343-D Sunrise Valley Dr.  
Reston, VA 22091  
**(703) 264-0770**

#### North/Central Area (WI, IL, IN, MI)

Roger Anderson  
Anderson Keller Group  
2502 North Clark St. #216  
Chicago, IL 60614  
**(312) 871-5212**

#### West Coast (CA, AZ, NM, TX) Contact: Chris E. Nunez Information Indexing, Inc. **(800) 888-0608 (714) 893-2471**

### DID YOU KNOW?

Did you know that a single CD-ROM disc, (4.75" dia) can store up to 250,000 pages of printed information or the equivalent of 600 megabytes of data?

Did you know that today's discs are being produced in a standard format called High Sierra/ISO 9660? This format enables all discs to be readable in all drives made by Hitachi, Sony, Toshiba, NEC...etc.

Did you know that this standard format lets publishers place different retrieval software on the same disc (ex: DOS, MAC, Unix, VMS)?

Did you know that there are over 2500 databases currently being published on CD-ROM discs?

Call and talk to us today. Information technology is the fastest growing business sector in the world. Information Indexing, Inc. is leading the way for sophisticated Engineering Applications.

**(714) 893-2471**  
**(714) 893-1380**

**Information Indexing Inc.**  
12832 Valley View St, Garden Grove, CA 92645

# CenBASE™/Materials 1991 Edition

*Types of Materials and Number of Entries as of 6/1/91*

ABS	401	POLYMETHYL METHACRYLIC	2	COBALT NICKEL	1
ABS/NYLON	3	POLYMETHYL METHACRYLATE	12	COPPER	8
ABS/PBT	3	POLYMETHYLENTETENE	27	COPPER NICKEL ALLOY	1
ABS/PC	25	POLYOLEFIN	29	COPPER NICKEL IRON	5
ABS/POLYOLEIN	1	POLYPHENYLENE ETHER	65	COPPER TIN	5
ABS/PVC	24	POLYPHENYLENE ETHER NYLON	9	COPPER ALLOY	1
ASA	10	POLYPHENYLENE ETHER/SB	18	COPPER NICKEL	4
ASA/PC	4	POLYPHENYLENE OXIDE	107	COPPER POWDER	5
ACETAL	213	POLYPHENYLENE SULFIDE	208	DUCTILE IRON	5
ACRYLIC	75	POLYPHENYLENE SULFIDE SULFONE	3	GERMANIUM	1
ACRYLIC/PVC	2	POLYPHENYLENYSULFONE	2	HAFNIUM	1
ACRYLIC SHEET	13	POLYPHTHALAMIDE	8	IRON	1
ACETATE	7	POLYPROPYLENE	1,647	IRON BASED ALLOY	5
BUTYRATE	9	POLYSTYRENE	242	IRON CHROMIUM ALUMINUM	3
PROPIONATE	9	POLYSTYRENE/POLYPROPYLENE	4	IRON COBALT NICKEL	1
ETHYLENE ACRYLIC ACID	11	POLYSULFONE	102	MANGANESE BRONZE	13
ETHYLENE ALPHA OLEFIN	7	POLYVINYLI CHLORIDE (PVC)	878	MOLYBDENUM	27
ETHYLENE COPOLYMER	4	PVC/ASA	3	MUNTZ METAL	1
ETHYLENE <i>n</i> -BUTYL ACRYLATE	4	ADHESIVE POLYMER	49	NICKEL	14
ETHYLENE VINYLACETATE (EVA)	81	BIODEGRADABLE	10	NICKEL ALLOY	40
ETHYLENE VINYL ALCOHOL	7	AMORPHOUS COPOLYMER	1	NICKEL ALUMINUM MANGANESE	1
FLUOROCARBON AMORPHOUS	2	AMORPHOUS POLYMER	1	NICKEL BRAZING ALLOY	11
FLUOROCARBON CTFE	9	SAN	98	NICKEL CHROMIUM ALLOY	5
FLUOROCARBON ECTFE	5	SMA	31	NICKEL CHROMIUM COPPER MOLY	1
FLUOROCARBON ETFE	13	SOLUBLE PLASTIC	15	NICKEL CHROMIUM	24
FLUOROCARBON PTFE	62	STYRENE ALLOY	1	NICKEL CHROMIUM MOLYBDENUM ALLOY	1
FLUOROCARBON FEP	10	STYRENE BUTADIENE	8	NICKEL CHROMIUM COBALT ALLOY	6
FLUOROCARBON PFA	9	STYRENE COPOLYMER	3	NICKEL CHROMIUM IRON MOLY COPPER	2
FLUOROCARBON PVDF	39	ENGINEERED THERMOPLASTIC POLYMER	1	NICKEL CHROMIUM IRON	16
FLUOROCARBON TFE	3	THERMOPLASTIC ALLOY	35	NICKEL CHROMIUM MOLY COLUMBIUM	1
IONOMER	31	VINYLCHLORIDE/ACRYLATE	12	NICKEL COBALT ALLOY	2
LIQUID CRYSTAL POLYMER	41	VINYLDENE CHLORIDE	13	NICKEL COPPER	1
LIQUID ENGINEERED	3	WEATHERABLE POLYMER	29	NICKEL IRON	11
NYLON	102	FLUOROELASTOMER	48	NICKEL IRON COBALT ALLOY	4
NYLON 4/6	13	FLUOROSILICONERUBBER	12	NICKEL IRON CHROMIUM MOLY COPPER	1
NYLON 6	562	NITRILE ELASTOMER, Etc	131	NICKEL MOLY	1
NYLON 6/6	803	POLYURETHANE	523	NICKEL SILVER	3
NYLON 6/9	5	RUBBER	82	NIOBIUM	6
NYLON 6/10	66	SILICONE	214	POTASSIUM	2
NYLON 6/12	132	THERMOPLASTIC ELASTOMERS	551	REINFORCED ALUMINUM	2
NYLON 11	49	EPOXY RESIN	197	RUBIDIUM	1
NYLON 12	109	HARDENER	64	SPECIALTY P/M POWDER	7
POLYIMIDE	32	THERMOSET ACRYLIC	12	TANTALUM	9
POLYARYLATE	10	THERMOSET ALKYD	29	TIN POWDER	4
POLYARYLETHERKETONE	13	THERMOSET DAP	71	TITANIUM	9
POLYARYLAMIDE	6	THERMOSET EPOXY	957	TUNGSTEN	4
POLYARYLSULFONE	12	THERMOSET MELAMINE	5	URANIUM	4
POLYBUTYLENE	14	THERMOSET MELAMINE PHENOLIC	12	VANADIUM	1
POLYCARBONATE	648	THERMOSET PHENOLIC	452	ZIRCONIUM	4
POLYCARBONATE/ABS	16	THERMOSET POLYDICYCLOPENTADIENE	2	STAINLESS STEEL	118
POLYCARBONATE/PET	11	THERMOSET POLYESTER	545	STEEL	156
POLYCARBONATE/PMMA	1	THERMOSET POLYIMIDE	22	METALS SPECIFICATIONS (MIL-HDBK-5E)	97
POLYCARBONATE/PBT	1	THERMOSET POLYURETHANE	64	COMPOSITES	526
POLYESTER	37	THERMOSETS SILICONE	19	ARAMID FIBER	3
POLYESTER/PCT	12	THERMOSET VINYL ESTER	29	CARBON FABRIC	6
POLYESTER/PTCA	5	ALUMINUM	236	CARBON FIBER	70
POLYESTER/PCTG	13	ALUMINUM BRONZE	25	CONTINUOUS/CHOPPED FIBER	8
POLYESTER/LCP	8	BERYLLIUM COPPER	8	GRAPHITE FIBER	6
POLYESTER/PBT ASA	6	CASTING MATERIAL	39	CERAMICS	479
POLYESTER/PBT PC	5	BERYLLIUM TUBING	1	TOTALS:	
POLYESTER/PBT	340	BISMUTH ALLOY	9	Thermoplastics	9,769
POLYESTER/PET	146	BRASS	16	Elastomers	1,646
POLYESTER/PETG	4	BRONZE	12	Thermosets	2,487
POLYESTER/TPPE	4	CESIUM	1	Composites & Fibers	623
POLYETHERIMIDE	66	CHROMIUM COBALT IRON	2	Ceramics	468
POLYETHERETHERKETONE (PEEK)	73	CHROMIUM IRON ALUMINUM	1	Metals	1,094
PEKEKK	8	COBALT NICKEL CHROMIUM MOLY	1	TOTAL MATERIALS COUNT	16,101
POLYKETONE	12	COBALT NICKEL CHROMIUM TIN	2		
POLYETHERSULFONE (PES)	92	COBALT ALLOY	15		
POLYETHYLENE	1,396				
POLYETHYLENE-CHLORINATED	20				
POLYMETHACRYLIMIDE	11				

# Manufacturers listed in CenBASE™/Materials

3M Industrial Chemical Products Division	Cyro Industries	Hunstman, Chemical Corporation	Renosol Corporation
A. L Hyde Company	Deer Polymer Corporation	Hysol Electronic, Chemicals Division	Resinoid Engineering Corporation
A. Shulman Inc.	Degussa Corporation	Industrial Dielectrics, Inc.	Rexene Resins
Acipco Steel Products	Devcon Industrial Products Group	ICI Films	Rhone-Poulenc Inc.
Accuratus Corp.	Dexter Plastics, The Dexter Corp.	Inco Alloys International, Inc.	Rodgers Engineering Corporation
Airtech International, Inc.	Diamonite Products	International Polymer Corporation	Rogers Corporation
Akzo Engineering Plastics	Dixon Industries Corporation	Ipsen Ceramics	Rohm and Haas Corporation
AI Tech Specialty Steel Corp.	The Dow Chemical Group	J-VON, A Division of Jones & Vining, Inc.	Rohm Tech, Inc., A Subsidiary of Rohm GmbH
Allied-Signal, Inc.	DSM-RIM Nylon, Inc.	Jessop Steel Co.	Rostone
Amoco Chemical Company	Du Pont Canada, Inc.	K-BIN, Inc.	Rototron Corp.
Ampco Metal	Du Pont USA (E.I. Du Pont De Nemours & Co., Inc.)	Kaneka America Corporation	Royalite Thermoplastics Division, Polycast Technology Corp.
Anderson Development Company	Duramic Products, Inc.	Keramont Corporation	RTP Company
Applied Composites	Dylon Ceramic Technologies	Keyser-Century Corporation	SABIC Marketing Ltd.
ARCO Chemical	Eagle Picher Industries	Kyocera America, Inc.	Sheffield Plastics, Inc.
Aremco Products, Inc.	Eastman Kodak Co., Performance Plastics, Eastman Chemicals Division	Lambertville Ceramic	Shell Chemical Company
Aristech Chemical Corp.	EDO Corporation	La Salle Steel Co.	Sherex Chemical Company
Baltimore Specialty Steels Corp., Subsidiary of Armco, Inc.	EGC Corporation	Latrobe Steel Co.	Shuman Plastics
Carbon Fibers Division, Ashland Oil, Inc.	Emerson & Cuming	Leco Corp.	Signode Packaging Systems Division
Ashley Polymers, Inc.	Emser Industries	LNP Engineering Plastics, ICI Advanced Materials	Silmar (A Division of Standard Oil Engineered Materials)
Astralloy Wear Technology, Harsco Corp.	Epic Resins	Lourich Company	SOLTEX Polymer Corporation
Astro Met Associates, Inc.	Epoxy Technology, Inc.	LSP Industrial Ceramics, Inc.	SOLVAY & Cie
Atochem, Inc.	The Epoxyte Corporation	M.A. Industries, Inc.	Stackpole Fibers Co.
Ausimont, Inc.	ERTA Incorporated	McCann Manufacturing, Inc.	Steward Ferrites
Bacon Industries, Inc.	ESK Engineered Ceramics	Mearthane Products Corporation	TACC International Corporation, Formulated Resins Division
Bamberger Polymers, Inc.	Ethyl Corporation	Hercules Aerospace Co.	Taita Chemical Co., Ltd.
BASF Corporation	EniChem Elastomeri SpA	Mitsui & Co. USA, Inc.	Tam Ceramics, Inc.
Baycomp, A Div. of Bay Mill Ltd.	Eval Company of America	Mobil Corporation	Teledyne Wah Chang Albany
The Belland Corp.	Exxon Chemical Company	Modified Plastics	Tenneco Polymers, Inc.
Bethlehem Steel Corp.	Ferro Corporation	Monmouth Plastics, Inc.	Tetraflour, Inc.
B.F. Goodrich Specialty Division & Chemicals Division	Fiberite Molding Materials, An ICI Company	Monsanto Chemical Company	Texapol Corp.
Borden Chemical, A Div. of Borden, Inc.	Filmco Industries	Montedison USA, Inc.	Textron
Brush Wellman, Inc.	Fina Oil and Chemical Company	Morton Thiokol, Inc.	Thermofil, Inc.
The Carbon/Graphite Group, Inc.	Fireline, Inc.	MPD, Inc.	Thermal Ceramics
Cal Polymer, Inc.	Firestone Synthetic Rubber & Latex Co.	MRC Polymers, Inc.	Thermoset Plastics, Inc.
Calcarb	Furon	Mykroy/Mycaley Ceramics	Toray Industries (America), Inc.
The Carborundum Company	Fiber Materials, Inc.	National Starch and Chemical Corp.	Tuftane, Film Products Division
Castall, Inc.	Fortafil Fibers, Inc., Great Lakes Carbon Corporation	Newport Composites, Inc.	USI Division, Quantum Chemical Corp.
Ceradyne, Inc.	Freeman Chemical Corporation	NIDI	UBE Industries, Ltd.
Cercom, Inc.	Formulated Systems Group, CIBA-GEIGY Corporation	Norplex/Oak	Union Carbide
Ceralox Corp.	GBC Materials Corp.	Norton Corp., Norton Performance Plastics	Valite
Cerro Metal Products	General Electric Company	Norton Industrial Ceramics	Visilox Systems, Inc.
Chevron Chemical Co.	Gencorp Company, Plastic Film Division	Novacor Chemicals, Inc.	Vista Polymers, Inc.
Chomerics, Inc.	Genesis Polymers	Occidental Chemical Corporation	Washington Penn Plastic Co., Inc.
CIBA-GEIGY Corporation	Georgia Gulf Corporation	Oremet Titanium	Wellman, Inc.
Colorite	Glastic Company	Phillips 66 Company	Wesgo Division, GTE Products
Comalloy International Corp.	Granmont, Inc.	Plaskolite, Inc.	Wisconsin Porcelain
Compounding Technology, Inc.	Green, Tweed Engineered Plastics	Plaskon Electronic Materials, Inc.	Zeon Chemicals, Inc.
Conap, Inc.	Griffith Polymers, Inc.	Plastics Engineering Company	Zircar Products, Inc.
Concept Polymer Technologies	Gulf States Steel Company	Pofil, Inc.	Zircoa, Inc.
Continental Polymers	Haysite Reinforced Plastics	Polycast Technology Corporation	As of December 1990
Coors Ceramics Company	Hercules Aerospace Co.	Polyfil, Inc., Royalite Thermoplastics Div.	
Dow Corning Corp.	Hexcel Corporation	Polymer Composites, Inc.	
Coshocton Stainless, Cyclops Corp.	Hi-Tek Polymers, Inc.	The Polymer Corporation	
Cosmic Plastics, Inc.	Hi-Tech Ceramics, Inc.	Polymer Technologies	
Custom Coating & Laminating Corp.	Himont U.S.A., Inc.	Polyply, Inc.	
Custom Resins, A Div. of Bernis Co., Inc.	Hoeschst Celanese Corporation	Polysar Incorporated	
American Cyanamid Company	Howmet Corp.	Premix, Inc.	
	HULS America Inc.	Quantum Composites, Inc.	
		Raymark Friction Co.	
		Reichhold Chemicals, Inc.	

## /PHYSICAL PROPERTIES

/LAST\_REVISED: 06/06/91 EFFECTIVE DATE:  
=====/MATERIAL CATEGORY : THERMOPLASTIC  
MATERIAL TYPE : POLYAMIDE-IMIDE  
/MATERIAL MFG : AMOCO  
/MATERIAL TRADE NAME: TORLON 2000  
/FILLER TYPE :  
/FORM :

/

/Mechanical Properties @Room Temp Value

/-----  
Elongation.@Yld.....(ASTM.D638).%(MD):.....15.00  
Flexural.Modulus.....(ASTM.D790).100ksi[GPa]:.....6.15[4.24]  
Flexural.Str.....(ASTM.D790).ksi[MPa]:.....24.00[165.36]  
Impact.Str.Notched.Izod.1/8" .(ASTM.D256).ft-lbs/in[J/m]:....3.50[186.90]  
Tensile.Str.@Yld.....(ASTM.D638).ksi[MPa](MD):.....19.00[13.09]

/

/Physical Properties @Room Temp Value

/-----  
Cost/lb.....(40000.lbs).\$/lb:.....21.75  
/(Note): 22,000 lb and over  
Cost/cuin.....=(SG)x(0.0361)x(cost/lb).\$/cuin:.....1.0757  
Specific.Gravity(SG).....(ASTM.D792):.....1.37

/

/Processing Properties @Room Temp (Injection Molding) Value

/-----  
Back.Pressure.....psi:.....30-100  
Barrel.Temp.Front.....F[C]:.....640-660[338-349]  
Barrel.Temp.Mid.....F[C]:.....630-650[332-343]  
Barrel.Temp.Rear.....F[C]:.....610-630[321-332]  
Injection.Pressure.....MPa:.....Minimum  
Injection.Pressure.....psi:.....Minimum  
Material.Drying.Temp.....F[C]:.....275[135]  
Melt.Temp.....F[C]:.....670[354]  
Mold.Shrinkage(1/8") ....(ASTM.D955).in/in:.....0.008  
Mold.Temp.....F[C]:.....320-410[160-210]  
Nozzle.Temp.....F[C]:.....645-670[341-354]  
Recommended.Drying.Time.....hrs:.....2  
Screw.Speed.....rpm:.....Moderate-Fast

/

/Thermal Properties @Room Temp Value

/-----  
Deflection.Temp....(ASTM.D648).@264psi.F[C]:.....515[268]

&lt;END&gt;

## /PHYSICAL PROPERTIES

/LAST\_REVISED: 04/05/91 EFFECTIVE DATE:

=====

/MATERIAL CATEGORY : METAL SPEC

MATERIAL TYPE : STEEL

/MATERIAL TRADE NAME: 4340

/MATERIAL SOURCE : MIL-HDBK-5E

/FORM : WROUGHT, BARS, FORGING, TUBING

/

/Mechanical Properties - Wrought, Air Melted Value

Tensile.Str.....	ksi[MPa]:.....	260.00[1791]
Tensile.Str.@0.2%Offset.....	ksi[MPa]:.....	215.00[148.14]
Compressive.Str.@0.2%Offset.....	ksi[MPa]:.....	240.00[165.36]
Shear.Str.....	ksi[MPa]:.....	156.00[107.48]
Bearing.Str.@Yld.....	ksi[MPa]:.....	347.00[239.08]
Bearing.Str.@0.2%Offset.....	ksi[MPa]:.....	309.00[212.90]
Elastic.Modulus.....	100ksi[GPa]:.....	290.00[199.81]
Rigidity.Modulus.....	10^6.psi:.....	11.00
Poisson's.Ratio:.....		0.32

/

/Physical Properties @Room Temp Value

Density.....	lbs./in^3[gm/cm^3]:.....	0.283[7.83]
--------------	--------------------------	-------------

/

/Thermal Properties @Room Temp Value

Coef.Linear.Exp.....	10^-5in/in/F[10^-5m/m/C]:.....	0.6[1.05]
Conductivity.....	Btu-in/hr/ft^2/F[W/m-K]:.....	10-22[1.4-3.2]
Specific.Heat.....	Btu/lbs./F[J/Kg/K]:.....	0.5-0.9[1-2]

Chemical Composition Properties -Typical Value

Carbon.(C).....	%:.....	0.38-0.43
Chromium.(Cr).....	%:.....	0.70-0.90
Manganese.(Mn).....	%:.....	0.60-0.80
Molybdenum.(Mo).....	%:.....	0.20-0.30
Nickel.(Ni).....	%:.....	1.65-2.00
Phosphorus.(P).....	%:.....	0.035

/(Note):

Silicon.(Si).....	%:.....	0.15-0.30
Sulfur.(S).....	%:.....	0.040

/(Note):

/

&lt;END&gt;

/APPLICATIONS DATA

/LAST\_REVISED: 07/09/90

EFFECTIVE DATE:

/=====

/MATERIAL CATEGORY : THERMOPLASTIC

/MATERIAL TYPE : POLYAMIDE-IMIDE

/MATERIAL MFG : AMOCO

/MATERIAL TRADE NAME: TORLON 7330

/FILLER TYPE :

/FORM :

/

/=====Description=====

TORLON Polyamide-imides are in a class by themselves among the engineering resins. They stand up under conditions often considered too severe for thermoplastics. While some resins may take 500 degrees (F) conditions for intermittent service. TORLON polymers maintain their strength at this elevated temperature. Polyamide-imides have, for this reason, been chosen for parts in the space shuttle and for experimental race car engine components.

Performance properties include strength retention over a wide range of temperatures and sustained stress, low creep, flame resistance, outstanding electricals, and high integrity in sever environments.

The high modulus of TORLON resins make them a good replacement for metal where stiffness is crucial to performance. TORLON parts can provide equivalent stiffness at significantly lower weights. Fatigue strength, impact resistance, fracture toughness and retention of properties after thermal aging are all in the exceptional category.

These high performance, molding grade resins are virtually unaffected by aliphatic and aromatic hydrocarbons, chlorinated and fluorinated hydrocarbons and by most acids at moderate temperatures. Of particular interest to aerospace and automotive engineers is the ability of TORLON polymers to hold their properties after exposure to lubricating fluids, turbine oils and hydraulic fluids.

TORLON 2000 Series resins have been developed to complement the standard TORLON product line with resins that offer easier processibility on standard injection molding machines and shorter cure times. The new grades demonstrate improved flow which allows the ability to mold larger parts, longer sections with more cavities per mold. This provides more versatility in the size and complexity of parts that could not be molded in the standard TORLON grades. The shorter cure cycles give the molder more flexibility in meeting production schedules for parts.

While the TORLON 2000 series resins offer significantly improved procesing parameters, the broad mechanical properties are retained.

Typical applications for TORLON 2000 series are in the areas of chemical processing, automotive, aviation/aerospace, machinery/bearings, electrical/electonic industries and in wear-resistant applications like components for industrial compressors.

<END>

## CHEMICAL RESISTANCE OF TORLON 4203

LAST REV.DATE: MAR 6, 1990

After 24 hour exposure at 93°C (200°F) unless otherwise noted.

Chemical Agents	% Retained (Tensile Strength)
<b>**Acids:**</b>	
Acetic (10%)	100
Glacial Acetic	100
Acetic Anhydride	100
Lactic	100
Benzene Sulfonic	28
Chromic (10%)	100
Formic (88%)	66
Hydrochloric (10%)	100
Hydrochloric (37%)	95
Phosphoric (35%)	100
Sulfuric (30%)	100
<b>**Bases:**</b>	
Ammonium Hydroxide (28%)	81
Sodium Hydroxide (15%)	43
Sodium Hydroxide (30%)	7
<b>**Aqueous Solutions**</b>	
(10% unless otherwise noted)	
Aluminum Sulfate	100
Ammonium Chloride	100
Ammonium Nitrate	98
Ammonium Sulfate	100
Barium Chloride	100
Bromine (Saturated solution, 120°F)	100
Calcium Chloride	100
Calcium Nitrate	96
Ferric Chloride	99
Magnesium Chloride	100
Potassium Permanganate	100
Sodium Bicarbonate	100
Silver Chloride	100
Sodium Carbonate	100
Sodium Chloride	100
Sodium Chromate	100
Sodium Hypochlorite	100
Sodium Sulfate	100
Sodium Sulfide	84
Sodium Sulfite	100
Water	100
<b>**Alcohols**</b>	
2 Aminoethanol	9
Amyl Ethanol	100
Butyl Ethanol	100
Cyclohexanol	100
Ethylene Glycol	100
<b>**Amines**</b>	
Aniline	97
n Butylamine	100
dimethylaniline	100
Ethylenediamine	7
Morpholine	100

Pyridine		43
**Aldehydes & Ketones**		
Acetophenone		100
Benzaldehyde		100
Cyclohexanone		100
Formaldehyde (37%)		100
Furfural		84
Methyl Ethyl Ketone		100
**Chlorinated Organics**		
Acetyl Chloride (120°F)		100
Benzyl Chloride (120°F)		100
Carbon Tetrachloride		100
Chlorobenzene		100
2-Chloroethanol		100
Chloroform (120°F)		100
Epichlorohydrin		100
Ethylene Chloride		100
**Esters**		
Amyl acetate		100
Butyl acetate		100
Butyl phthalate		100
Ethyl acetate		100
Butyl Ether		100
Cellosolve		100
p-Dioxane (120°F)		100
Tetrahydrofuran		100
**Hydrocarbons**		
Cyclohexane		100
Diesel fuel		99
Gasoline (120°F)		100
Heptane		100
Mineral Oil		100
Motor Oil		100
Stoddard Solvent		100
Toluene		100
Xylene		100
**Nitriles**		
Acetonitrile		100
Benzonitrile		100
**Nitro Compounds**		
Nitrobenzene		100
Nitromethane		100
**Miscellaneous**		
Cresyldiphenyl Phosphate		100
Sulfolane		100
Triphenylphosphite		100

\*+++++\*  
<END>

/ADVANCED ENGINEERING DATA  
/GE Engineering Design Database  
/LAST\_REVISED: 6/26/91  
=====

MATERIAL CATEGORY : THERMOPLASTIC  
/MATERIAL TYPE : POLYCARBONATE  
/MATERIAL MFG : GENERAL ELECTRIC  
/MATERIAL TRADE NAME: LEXAN 101  
/FILLER TYPE :  
=====

## MOLDFLOW CONSTANTS

Specific.heat.of.melt.....(J/KG-DEG(C)): 2052.00  
Thermal.Conductivity.....(J/M-SEC-DEG(C)): 0.320  
Melt.Density.....(KG/M\*\*3): 1017.000  
Freeze.Temperature.....(DEG(C)): 152.000  
No-Flow.Temperature.....(DEG(C)): 175.000  
Vicosity.Constant.A.....: -553765  
Shear.Constant.B.....: -0.270  
Temperature.Constant.C.....: -0.018  
2nd.order.fit.constant.A1.....: 0.87713E+01  
2nd.order.fit.constant.A2.....: -031218E+00  
2nd.order.fit.constant.A3.....: 0.10383E-01  
2nd.order.fit.constant.A4.....: -0.86242E-01  
2nd.order.fit.constant.A5.....: 0.36695E-02  
2nd.order.fit.constant.A6.....: -0.80226E-04

## RHEOLOGY DATA

#1 =====| Shear Rate vs. Viscosity |=====

Apparent Shear Rates and Viscosity at specific temperatures.

=====

%BeginGraph  
Title.: SHEAR RATE as a function of VISCOSITY  
Sub...: (LEXAN 101)  
Xtitle: Shear Rate (Sec -1)  
Ytitle: Viscosity (Pa \* sec)  
Nplots: 3

=====

T: 320 deg C  
X: 10000 ,6310 ,3980 ,2510 ,1580 ,1000 ,631 ,398 ,251 ,158 ,100 /  
Y: 90 ,119 ,162 ,209 ,268 ,313 ,354 ,382 ,399 ,410 ,415 /

=====

T: 330 deg C  
X: 10000 ,6310 ,3980 ,2510 ,1580 ,1000 ,631 ,398 ,251 ,158 ,100 /  
Y: 84 ,111 ,143 ,187 ,231 ,267 ,292 ,308 ,319 ,321 ,324 /

=====

T: 340 deg C  
X: 10000 ,6310 ,3980 ,2510 ,1580 ,1000 ,631 ,398 ,251 ,158 ,100 /  
Y: 78 ,100 ,126 ,157 ,191 ,217 ,234 ,247 ,251 ,259 ,263 /

=====

%EndGraph

MOLDFLOW is a registered trademark of MOLDFLOW Ltd.

<END>